The
JOHN H. MUNRO
LIBRARY

Presented to the

SAN FRANCISCO
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

by

Katharine Craig Munro

Stack N

Case 2

Shelf a

MEZZANINE

FUR PRÆDESTINATUS.

THE

PREDESTINATED THIEF;

OR A

DIALOGUE BETWEEN A CALVINISTIC PREACHER

AND A

THIEF SENTENCED TO BE HANGED:

IN WHICH IS REPRESENTED TO THE LIFE, HOW THE DOGMAS OF THE CALVINISTS NOT ONLY FURNISH A HANDLE TO THE PERPETRATION OF CRIMES AND IMPIETIES, BUT, MOREOVER, PROVE THE GREATEST OBSTACLE TO THE REFORMATION AND REPENTANCE OF SINNERS.

WRITTEN ORIGINALLY IN LATIN BY

WILLIAM SANCROFT,

Archbishop of Canterbury.

Quid nobis prodest Christus ejusve Spiritus, verbumque prædicatum, a Deo contrarium si sit prædestinatum?

Christus si suo prodesse debet Spiritu, verboque nos reformare, necesse est Deum contrarium non prædestinare.

LONDON:

CHAPMAN, BROTHERS, 121, NEWGATE-STREET.

T. LE MESSURIER, ABBEY-STREET, DUBLIN.

MDCCCXLVI.

DUBLIN:

Printed at the Patent Platen Steam-Press of JOHN FALCONER, 32, Marlborough-street.

FUR PRÆDESTINATUS.

TO THE READER.

THE Author of the PREDESTINATED THIEF, in a Prefatory Address to the Christian reader, cautions him against supposing that the opinions held and defended by the thief are deduced from the Scriptures. Let it not be imagined, says he, that from them can proceed anything so monstrous and unhallowed. The doctrines here exposed are stated in the very words of those doctors, who, among the Calvinists are esteemed most highly, and held to be the most orthodox—doctrines which we allege are abominable, overturn evangelical piety from the foundations, and pave and open up a broad highway to the perpetration of flagitious crimes.

There are many men of little perspicacity or inquiry who do not perceive how pernicious and absurd is the doctrine of precise and rigid predestination. This is the reason for publishing the following Dialogue, from which it will appear more clearly than meridian day that those dogmas which are held, professed, and published, by those most orthodox doctors are as much to be avoided as the smoking lake of hell.

If the title seem strange and harsh, let not that offend you, kind reader, since it can be proved to demonstration, that numbers have been carried away by those abominable tenets to commit, not only theft, plunder, and rapine, but, moreover, to have given themselves up to robberies and other detestable crimes; so that if wishes could prove efficient, we should wish that sad experience had not supplied us with enough, and more than enough of examples.

These things being considered, it will be sufficiently evident that the title is appropriate to the subject handled in the Dialogue. Farewell.

This address to the reader is followed by a long list of the most notorious orthodox doctors and teachers of Calvinism, among whom are the names of Beza, Calvin, Bucer, Perkins, Piscator, with the Synod of Dort, and the *Colloquium Hagiense*. In the Dialogue, the thief makes a dexterous use of the arguments of the Calvinistic writers, with which he is quite familiar. He has studied their theology, and understands their principles; he reasons upon them logically, and pursues them to their legitimate consequences. These are startling, even to his Calvinistic collocutor, who is unable to refute them.

The exposure of the tenets of Calvinism always kindles the wrath of those who hold them, though those tenets are so monstrous, as expressed even in the language of their own creeds and catechisms, that it is scarcely possible to misrepresent or render them more revolting than they really are. Prior to the Meeting of the Synod of Dort, in 1618, the Remonstrants of Holland had written and preached against them as subversive of all piety and morality. It was objected by them that "The doctrine of the Reformed (Calvinistic) Churches, concerning predestination, and the heads connected with it, by its own proper nature and impulse, draws away the minds of men from all piety and religion; that it is the pillow of the flesh and of the devil, the citadel of Satan, from which he lies in ambush for all, wounds very many, and fatally pierces through many, as well with javelins of desperation as of security: that the same doctrine makes God the author of sin, unjust, a tyrant, a hypocrite; nor is it any other than interpolated Stoicism, Manicheism, Libertinism, and Turcism: that it renders men secure, as being persuaded that it does not hinder the salvation of the elect, in what manner soever they live; and they can with safety perpetrate the most atrocious crimes; that it does not profit the reprobate, as to salvation, if they would truly do all the work of the saints; that by the same doctrine it is taught that God, by the bare and mere determination of his will, without any respect of the sins of any man, predestinated and created the greatest part of the world to eternal damnation; that in the same manner as election is the fountain and cause of faith and good works, reprobation is the cause of infidelity and impiety; that many unoffending infants of believers are torn away from the breasts of their mothers, and tyrannically precipitated into hell, so that neither baptism, nor the prayers of the Church at their baptism, profit them."

This passage is taken from the Rev. Thomas Scott's "Articles of the Synod of Dort," and as he is the varnisher and defender of their impious tenets, he apologizes for quoting it, it is so "horribly irreverent." But, notwithstanding his indignation and its horrible irreverence, these objections are precisely such as must occur to every well-informed mind, capable of reasoning on the subject. Let any one who doubts it only consult the writings of Calvinistic writers and his doubts will vanish; but he needs not go beyond the "Westminster Confession of Faith," and the "Institutes of Calvin." That Confession teaches the utter depravity of human nature; that in consequence of Adam's transgression, "man became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body; that by original corruption we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil." It teaches, that by an immutable decree of God, "some men and some angels are predestinated to everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death; and that the number is so certain and definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished." It teaches that God predestinated the elect, "without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving him thereunto;" and, as to the rest of mankind, God was pleased to "pass them by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice!!" It teaches that those who are not of the elect number cannot be saved, "much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they ever so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and the law of that religion they do profess," a most merciless article, which condemns the whole heathen world to perdition, and which, in contradiction to the Apostle Paul, would justify the calculation of Dr. Lewis Du Moulin, who maintained that "not one in a hundred thousand, nay, probably not one in a million, from Adam down to our times, shall be saved." And what is to be the doom of those not in the small number of the elect?" "most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell fire, for ever;" and this we are told is for God's glory, and "to the praise of his glorious justice!" But all this, bad as it is, is not the worst. Calvin represents God as acting, not only with the most merciless tyranny to his creatures, but, *horresco referens*, as acting hypocriti-

cally, having "two wills, the one outward and revealed, whereby he most tenderly invites sinners to his grace, and most graciously calls them to repentance, *seeming as though* he were earnestly desirous of their salvation; whereas his other will is inward and secret, which is irresistible, and takes effect infallibly; and by this he brings men, through ways unavoidable, to an estate and course of sin here, and then to eternal damnation and punishment hereafter."

Not contented with denouncing the majority of mankind to "grievous torments in body and soul, without intermission, in hell fire for ever," Calvinism betrays an impatience to antedate their doom, and to commence the punishment by first robbing and then burning those whom it calls heretics in this world. Lord Brougham, in his speech on the Maynooth Bill, said, "if he were required to name the one who most strongly laid down, not the right only, but the duty of extirpating heretics, he would say Calvin. And what he preached he supported by act and example. By acts of the most atrocious perfidy, and by opening letters, he entrapped Servetus to Geneva, and there, because he suspected him of Socinian doctrines, after a mockery of a trial, had him burned alive. The same tendency to persecute was exhibited even by the pilgrim fathers who settled the first colonies in N. America. Mr. Jared Sparks, in his history of Massachussetts, states, that in the very first ship that returned to England from the settlement of Salem, two persons were sent home in irons, to be dealt with by the brethren, for having used the form of Common Prayer prescribed by the Church."

Happily for Unitarians, the law for burning heretics exists no longer, and a just legislature has rescued them from one of the foulest conspiracies to rob and destroy them that was ever hatched in the den of bigotry and intolerance.

As to the Westminster Confession, it is a mass of contradictions the most irrational and antiscriptural, though assuming to be founded on Scripture; blasphemous as to the perfections of God; degrading and false as to the nature of man, and utterly at variance with the precepts and doctrines of the holy and benevolent Jesus. Yet this is the Confession which all the ministers of the General Assembly of Ulster, and of the Scottish Church, are obliged to subscribe? That such a book should be admitted as the accredited standard of faith and doctrine, by any portion of the christian world, is disgraceful to the age in which we live, and a lamentable proof how little the

great truths of genuine christianity are known and understood. How long will any people, baptized as christians, suffer themselves to be priest-ridden, mystified, deluded, and rendered miserable by such unhallowed doctrines as those, which it is the object of the Predestinated Thief to expose?

William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, was the author of the Fur Prædestinatus, which was first printed in London in 1651—"at a time," says his biographer, "when the semblance of superior sanctity was assumed, to veil the purposes of enormous wickedness; and religious motives pretended, to justify the most enormous crimes. It was intended to expose the doctrines of rigid Calvinism, the extensive prevalence of which had advanced very far in destroying all just and sound views of religion * * obstructing the natural influence of Christianity on the human heart, and giving a free rein to perverse and headstrong passions."—"It may perhaps on the whole be deemed the most successful exposure which has ever appeared, of the tendency of the Calvinistic doctrines when maintained in their unqualified strictness, as showing that, instead of nurturing and encouraging those feelings of humility, piety, and goodness, which are the genuine fruits of Christianity, they give birth to spiritual pride and self-satisfaction; give a free rein to licentious passions; bring the sinner to a hardened and impenitent state; and thus pervert the whole effect which this holy religion ought to have upon the human heart."

In 1688 Sancroft concurred with other Lords spiritual and temporal, in a declaration to the Prince of Orange for a free Parliament and due indulgence to Protestant Dissenters. He refused to take the oath of allegiance to William III. and his consort, and had consequently to resign the Bishoprick. He was a man of great industry and learning. Born, 1616: Died, 1693. His life has been written by George D'Oyly, D.D., F.R.S. *in two volumes. London*, 1821.

The Fur Prædestinatus was originally written in Latin. "An edition of it was published, in 1813, for Sharpe, Fenchurch-street,

London; and, in 1814, an English translation was prepared and published by Dr. Nichols, Dean of Middleham, with an Appendix, exemplifying the argument by the case of a malefactor executed at Northampton."

The present translator has never seen either of those publications. His translation is from the text edited by Dr. D'Oyly.

The FUR PRÆDESTINATUS may remind the classical reader of Lucian's dialogue between Minos, the judge of hell, and Sostrates the robber. Minos, as an equitable judge, seems to have acted on the scriptural principle, of rewarding or punishing men according to the deeds done in the body, whether good or evil; for while he sentences tyrants and robbers to be torn by the chimæra or preyed on by vultures, he desires the good, οἱ αγαθοι, to be conveyed to elysium and the islands of the Blessed—*αν θ' ων δικαια εποιειτε παρα τον βιον*—in recompence of the good works which they did during life. As for Sostrates the robber and murderer, he commands him to be thrown into the burning lake, Phlegethon. But Sostrates demurs, and pleads arrest of judgment. Minos graciously consents to hear what he can urge in his defence. Sostrates then constrains Minos to acknowledge that all human actions are predestinated by fate, or, as Calvin would say, by an eternal and immutable decree, and in consequence affirms that he is by no means responsible for the robberies and murders which he has committed: they were all decreed by fate, or destiny, in whose hands he was only an instrument, and no more to be blamed than the sword in the hands of an assassin. The judge has common sense; admits the validity of his plea, and remits the intended punishment.

The Grecian Satirist understood the principles of justice much better than Calvin, and the men of his school.

THE

PREDESTINATED THIEF:

A

DIALOGUE BETWEEN A CALVINISTIC PREACHER

AND A

THIEF CONDEMNED TO BE HANGED,

ON THE NIGHT PREVIOUS TO HIS EXECUTION.

PREACHER.—Good evening, young man; pray inform me, how has your life been spent?

THIEF.—As it pleased the Omnipotent God, who governs all things by his arbitrary will, to decree concerning me in eternity, and to accomplish in time.

Pr.—You say well;—but one thing grieves me, and must grieve you most of all—that you are bound in fetters, and have nothing to expect but a detestable death.

Th.—Truly this is most certain. Yet I know not whether you or I should be so very sorrowful, since neither of us can be certain whether by an immutable decree of God, I am predestined to everlasting life, or to infernal torments.

Pr.—Of that anon. In the mean time, since sentence has been passed upon you to be hanged to-morrow, I have come hither by request, and am ready to consider whether you can be translated to Paradise, like the robber in the gospel; you will, therefore, inform me what sins you have committed, that I may make my exhortation appropriate to your condition, and say something that may contribute to your soul's salvation.

Th.—Most willingly; provided you can lend a listening ear to all that I shall have to narrate:—My parents, from my earliest years, took due care to have me well instructed, intending that, at a proper age, I should be sent to the university. What was to be done, then? The university of Leyden was filled with heresies; at Francquer the students were votaries of Bacchus; they quarrelled, fought, and, like the most ferocious warriors, were continually engaged in giving and receiving challenges to single combat. The

Bishop of our church advised that I should be sent to this seat of learning, deeming it better that I should become a priest of Bacchus and a son of Mars than a heretic, since the former can only destroy the body while the latter can slay and destroy the soul. Accordingly, having received my parents' blessing, I proceeded to Franequer, where I found the ale so excellent, the price so low, the society so delightful, that all my finances were soon exhausted in conviviality. When my parents learned that my Muses were so intently occupied in poring over the volumes of Bacchus, they recalled me and banished me to France, where the living was more frugal, and ebriety reputed a vice. I went to Paris, where there is a confluence of all nations; and as there the most generous wine costs little or nothing, I thought I should best perform my duty by liberal potations—by being constantly anointed with the thyrsus of Bacchus, and in being inseparable from the bosoms of the fair. At length I led a life so irregular that when it came to my parents' knowledge, they issued their mandate for me to depart to Geneva, and there pursue my studies. Our ecclesiastical adviser had informed them that Geneva was a holy city in which no toleration was given to drunkenness, to conviviality, dancing, harlotry, or any worldly allurements. Their credulous simplicity was easily persuaded to believe all this; and they flattered themselves with the notion that I, like a second Samuel with Eli, should dwell continually in the house of the Lord. Their command was imperative; I obeyed, and found at Geneva a hostess that rivalled Venus in beauty, with an attendant sufficiently accommodating, and both exhibiting such piety, that each might be taken for an incarnation of Sanctity herself. They attended their church daily, and participated in the Lord's Supper, I know not how often during the course of the year. At first I dared not to raise my eyes to the contemplation of such holiness; but as time nourishes and brings all things to perfection, I found at length that in all respects they corresponded to my wishes. Above all, that I might win the favour of the preachers of the word, and of the Consistory, I never neglected their meetings, occasionally entering the church with a great bundle of books under my arm, and choosing my seat immediately beneath the pulpit, I searched in the Scriptures for every text quoted by the preacher, and soon rose into the highest estimation. At the same time wishing to appear as a satrap, or noble, I girded a sword to my side, and walked about with a young Ganeymede attending me * * one whose delicate leg, when the boots were off, might have been mistaken for that of a damsel. Sometimes, with him as my companion, I sailed on the lake, climbed the hills, or sauntered in the green vallies. Nor were wine, and cards, and dice, and the sweet music of birds, mingling in harmony with the voices of other animals, wanting to dissipate ennui. Nor was the sound of stringed musical instruments, so soothing to the brain, absent, only due care was taken, by the insertion of a damper among the chords, to soften the sounds and prevent them

from being heard out of doors. On serene days we lighted a lamp, drew curtains before the windows, spread carpets on the floor, and taking off our shoes, joined in the festive dance, (tripping it on the gay fantastic toe).

Pr.—What would have been the consequence had such conduct as this been divulged? In the holy city of Geneva dancing is held to be an unatonable impiety.

Th.—I should have had cause to deprecate a severe punishment. The matter, however, became known, and when I and my companion were cited to appear before the Bishop, I thought that bread and water would be our only fare. But in this we were agreeably disappointed; for our brothers and little sisters, splendidly apparelled, visited us every day, eat and drank luxuriously, and danced in the upper story of the contiguous dwelling till they made the rafters shake, and that as long as we were detained. As soon as the term of our penitence had expired, we were brought before the Consistory, where, in lengthy harangues, we were upbraided with the turpitude of our misdeeds. We were then obliged to fall on our faces, and creep on our knees and elbows before the pulpit, and in presence of a full congregation entreat pardon of God and of the church for the scandal we had given. But no farther disgrace followed; the multitude of similar examples absorbed the shame; the majority of the principal inhabitants of the city, yea, the rulers and preachers themselves being subject to the same condemnation. Notwithstanding, I foresaw that if the evil report should become rife, it would fix a stain upon my name, and therefore deemed it prudent to consider seriously what was best to be done, and anticipate the evil before it could reach Batavia. Forthwith I appeared before the Consistory, and drawing deep sighs from the bottom of my breast

Cordicremos gemitus, et singultantia verba,

Heart burning groans and words with sobs confused,

and only not belching out rheum, I said that I came among them a stranger, to whom the laws of the elders and the genius of the people were unknown. I exclaimed that I had been seduced. I asked of myself how I could be precipitated into such an abyss of wickedness among a people of such unstained and sanctified morals, and eagerly inquired how I could most happily escape the perverse society into which it had been my misfortune to fall. In the church I howled as a dog, I twisted like an eel, and by my language sustained the character I assumed so well, that there was not one who did not commiserate my case and judge me a proper vessel (for the reception of divine grace). I then went apart to the preacher, told him of my lamentable backslidings, made woful complaint of my sad condition, and said that I might now depart like a sheep that had wandered from the fold, and dared no longer to meet the face of my parents. The preacher, hearing all this, consoled me by the example

of David, Solomon, Mary Magdalene, and others, all of whom had been guilty of enormous transgressions. In short, I so moved the preacher by my fine speeches, that he wrote letters to my father, hyperbolically commending my genius, diligence, and modesty, and exhorting my parents to entertain no doubt of their being joyfully and amply remunerated for all their expenses on my account. I took diligent care that these letters should reach their destination; and I added some of my own, in which, with much subtlety, I discussed the doctrines of Predestination and Free-will, inserting some Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and French expressions. I extolled the sanctity of the city, the erudition of the pastors, and thanked my parents for having brought me back to the paths of salvation. This intelligence gave them such delight that they increased my allowance by the addition of forty crowns. But all was in vain. The horse having once overleaped the barrier can no longer be bridled in; all shame was lost. I daily grew worse and worse, and in my excesses so exorbitant, that I was ordered home.

Dreading the workhouse of Amsterdam, I remained there till I had acquired some credit. Then I made my escape, and took the way to Rome, having converted my Genevese cloak into a Roman toga, and following the example of those who journey to Rome for the sake of religion; I placed reeds in my cap, as they do who worship the relics of St. James, that I might with more facility find admission into the hotels and monasteries, and depart from them when I pleased. This mode of life, however, was too mean and sordid to satisfy me long. I determined to live like a prince though evil should befal me. In the fields and woods I became a plunderer; in towns a house-breaker and cut-purse. In that mode of life I passed through Germany into Holland, where, by stratagem or violence, I carried away the goods and fortunes both of citizens and farmers. Thus I joyfully spent six years of my life in the company of harlots and robbers, but it is now apparent that all my pleasures are to terminate in one sad half-hour.

Pr.—I see that you have been an enormous sinner. For your great wickednesses you deserve to be twice hanged: yea, to be sentenced to the flames of hell; and it does excite my special wonder to hear you narrate your crimes with laughter, just as if you had nothing to fear from the heavy burden lying on your soul. Tell me, then,—whither do you think you must go when you leave this world?

Th.—Whither? To heaven, to be sure, as well as you, who are not much better than myself.

Pr.—What! do you imagine yourself as good and honest as I am?

Th.—Yes, I think so; and truly too, by your own confession. For your best works are by themselves stinking and putrid, fœtid, deformed, detestable; yea, verily, mere abominations and sins * * * you are covered all over with putrifying sores and rottenness, so that by none of your works can you be received and esteemed with God, since even those which you deem the best, merit

nothing but eternal punishment; and you have sinned against all the divine precepts most grievously, neither have you kept any of them, and now you are inclined to all malice and hatred both to God and your neighbour.

In your prayers, printed at the end of your Psalter, you confess, my most worthy Sir, that your nature is not only blind in understanding, but that it is indisposed to, and disqualified for the performance of any good; that it has revolted from God; that it follows its own desires; that it most grievously sins every day; that it was rendered so impure by original sin, that through it various depraved desires fighting against God and your neighbour dwell in you, so that you transgress the commandments of God often and without intermission. In short, you are a miserable sinner, conceived and born in all pravity and corruption, prone to all evil, indisposed to all good, so that by your incessantly sinful life you excite the wrath of God against you, and, according to his righteous judgment, alas! you draw condemnation on yourself. For this your conscience accuses you; your sins testify against you; convicted by a feeling of your own corruption, you often groan and wish to be liberated from your body. To be brief: from your earliest years you have been unprofitable; in your nativity you were a child of wrath, the heir of divine vengeance; while you were yet in your mother's womb, you held communion with devils damned; you were full of natural venom from which all evil works emanate; externally you could do nothing but sin, yea, even when you were a little infant, if you could only find occasion. For your nature is as prone to sin as a serpent is by nature prone to strike; and as a serpent or viper is hated by man, not for the wounds it has inflicted, but for the venom lodged in itself, so are you abhorred by God on account of the natural venom which is conceived and born with you. All these things, and many more of the same kind, you declare of yourself, and have even subscribed them with your own hand, insomuch that you accuse as heretics, Pelagians, Socinians, Unitarians, Cornehirtists, and Perfectists, all who refuse to make the same confession; and what think you? If any Shimei, in his destined work, should assail and vilify you with all manner of abuse and vituperation, could he vomit out more foul reproaches against you?

Pr.—For the honour, majesty, and superabundant grace of God, I willingly and sincerely confess myself guilty of all this. It is God's will that his faithful and elect should be such sinners, that they may not vaunt themselves, but be humble; and humility consists in this, viz., that we may judge ourselves destitute of all good and all righteousness.

Th.—Long since have I well considered this matter, Mr. Preacher, and judged that if I spoke the undisguised truth, no good whatever could be performed by me. For the farther distant I was from all good, the more truly might I confess that I was destitute of all good and all righteousness.

Pr.—Not so. I would not be thus understood. God wills us to be sinners that we may not depend on good works, but on his grace alone; and that we should not seek to be justified by our works.

Th.—So think I: and because I knew well that it was a deadly sin to depend on good works, and seek by them to be justified, and also by what arts the devil lays snares for men that he may immesh them in heresy, I shunned all good works, and trusted to the grace of God alone.

Pr.—Absurd and preposterous; thus distorting all things, do you wish to mount the chariot and drive? You interpret my doctrine no otherwise than if it were the cause of your wicked life. Far from it. God intends this: that men may not seek to be justified by works, but by faith.

Th.—What faith?

Pr.—That faith which our Catechism in the 60th question teaches—I believe only in Jesus Christ, by which faith I am justified before God. Of all these things my conscience accuses me; against all the divine precepts most grievously have I sinned; I have kept none of them, and now I am propense to all wickedness. Nevertheless God, of his mere grace, without any merits of mine, gives and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction of Christ, his righteousness, and sanctity, just as if I had no sin, or had committed no sin; yea, as if I had yielded the same perfect obedience as Christ himself, whilst I apply such benefit to myself with a believing heart.

Th.—In truth, Sir Preacher, that was always my pure and undefiled faith, and that I might adhere more and more closely to that doctrine of the Reformed Church, I wearied God with my prayers, that I might persist in the faith without any good works. So that this remained fixed in my mind, and was often the theme of my discourse, that the chief art and wisdom of Christians was to know and acknowledge nothing of laws, nothing of good works, and not so much as the black of a bean of operative justification. For a Christian wants no works, no law, since by faith he is liberated from all laws. Faith alone is necessary for our justification; from all things else we are free; besides it, there are no mandates, no interdicts; good works render no man good, bad works render no man bad. And since no good work is useful for the salvation or justification of unbelievers, so on the other hand, no evil work renders any one evil, nor condemns him: nothing does this but unbelief alone. Where faith is no sin can hurt.

Pr.—What then? Have you not good works also? We are taught, indeed, that faith in Christ justifies, but we are also bound to observe the commands of God, since it is written, "If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments."

Th.—Softly brother; for, admitting this, you deny Christ and abolish faith. You attribute to the divine commands or laws that which is due to God alone; and then I should be almost induced to believe that you had got some taint of heresy, whilst you ascribe to

good works the slightest share in our justification. I must confirm you in this doctrine, Sir Preacher, because "narrow is the way," you must contract yourself if you wish to pass. For they who are loaded with good works, like travellers to the relics of St. James whom we see surrounded with fardels, are unable to get along. Whilst, then, you approach loaded with great bags of good works, you must either lay them down, or find yourself unable to prosecute your journey.

Pr.—Good works, I confess, are not to be regarded as an impulsive cause in our justification or salvation. In the mean time, however, we should guard against sins.

Th.—That we should. Let us be on our guard against sins, but still more against the law and good works, and attend only to the divine promises, and the great end. Gracious God! What good can we do, miserable sinners, when even the most holy men during their whole lives make so small a beginning of obedience, that even from them cannot proceed a single work which does not merit the punishment of shame; yea, that does not merit eternal damnation rather than the reward of life? Away with your saintling workmongers! Down with your good works! Tread in my footsteps, who place my faith and salvation on the grace and mercy of God alone. For so rich is the Christian who is only baptized, that he cannot, even if he would, incur the loss of salvation by any sins, however flagrant they may be, provided he does not become weak in the faith. Such are the doctrines of Luther and Calvin, and are not these your great reformed doctors?

Pr.—They are. Nevertheless I perceive, my friend, that you, confiding in their dogmas, have perpetrated some atrocious sins; whence it seems necessary that you should be instructed in the will of God, and in what he claims obedience.

Th.—You speak truth, Preacher. But do you imagine that I have not thought profoundly concerning that matter? Certainly I have; and long and oft have I prudently weighed with myself what parts I had to perform. I considered that the will of God was double—hidden and revealed—so that God wills many things which he has revealed to be against his will. For example: the Lord, by the hand of Moses, gave command to Pharaoh, saying, "Let my people go;" when, nevertheless, it was the hidden will and purpose of God that he should not suffer the people to go. Nor should this seem surprising, since God, by a hidden decree, has determined that sin shall be committed by those whom he has enjoined to walk in a right way.

Pr.—How so? Think you when you sin that you perform the will of God?

Th.—If you attend to the hidden will of God by which he decrees to bring all things to his own mark and design, and if you adjust the means to the end, you will find that the impious do the will of God; but if you look only to his revealed will they do not perform it.

Pr.—You say well; wherefore it behoved you always to attend to the revealed will, because the hidden will was beyond your ken.

Th.—In sooth, Sir, these two wills were perpetually grinding in my brain and resounding as in a horse-mill. For, seeing that God did not always will that which he revealed as his will, while that which he did not reveal was truly and properly his will, and besides that in his ineffable counsels he willed that, for different ends, things should be done which he commanded not to be done, I was not very intent on the discovery of his revealed will.

Pr.—How can you utter such blasphemies?

Th.—I speak the very truth; for when God's hidden will always and alone can be done, and nothing in the world can take place which he does not will; yea, since this hidden will of God is the necessary cause of all things, so that God himself, of his own good pleasure, and by his sovereign decree, wills sin to exist, I judged it always most safe to follow the efficacious will of God that I might not undertake a vain and profitless labour.

Pr.—It is manifest that God, according to his hidden omnipotent decree and good pleasure, is unwilling to have that done, which, in his revealed will, he has commanded to be done; and you cannot deny that all things, as is evident, are infallibly and necessarily produced by God's decree. I expressly profess this to be my doctrine and opinion, nevertheless it was incumbent on you to guard yourself against sin with greater solicitude.

Th.—I have read in the sacred Scriptures that vain solicitude of mind is prohibited by Christ, as when he assures us that we cannot add a cubit to our stature, nor make one hair white or black. Then I thought I should act much less wisely should I become refractory and struggle against the decree and efficacious will of God. I must confess that all the operations of men, and all human movements internal and external, whether evil or good, of the mind, heart, will, are directed by, and receive their guidance, from the power and impulse of divine Providence, and it is impossible for men to avoid choosing or doing what God wills. The fall of Adam was destined by God, and thus it comes to pass that men can neither think nor will aught but what God inspires or puts into their minds, whether it be good or evil, so that in their very acts he governs the hands of men. One while he has them bound; at another he turns them hither and thither, to the end that he may effect that which he has predestined. This doctrine is valid not only as it respects the evil but the good, for however strenuously men may labour like wild and untameable beasts to perpetrate all kinds of depravity, they are so governed by hidden and secret reins, that they cannot bend a finger, but they do the work of God rather than their own. For God so works by instruments that he not only permits what they do, or governs the event only, but also excites, impels, moves, rules, and what crowns all, creates, moreover, that by those means he may accomplish what he has decreed. For this end, without doubt, God

gives their will and inclination to the impious, and therefore it may with reason be affirmed that God is the sole genuine cause of all things—willing and effecting that the wicked may live in the gratification of all their evil desires, and thence the necessity of sinning, as to God, is placed upon them. Wherefore, Sir Preacher, all your prattle and dictation about solicitude and watchfulness is sheer folly and impertinence. For the ungodly, by the hidden hand of God, by strength or potential influence, as by a concealed noose, are ignorantly drawn to a mark unknown to themselves, as an arrow when shot from a bow strikes the spot at which it is aimed, although it neither designs nor knows its destination.

Pr.—You seem to me to be the dictator and prattler, and are not ashamed to make God the author of your sins.

Th.—If by the author you understand him who persuades, drives, impels, or in any mode furnishes an occasion of doing an evil deed, you may truly call God the author of sin; for example, when Adam is the cause of sin, and God is the cause of Adam, wherefore should not God be considered as the first cause? But it is proper to understand this with some discretion: the same offence, suppose it to be adultery or homicide, in so far as God is the author, mover, or instigator, is no crime, but inasmuch as it is the work of a man, it is a crime and atrocity. For by reason of just causes, though to us unknown, such deeds proceed from God as are wickedly perpetrated by men, and God secretly propels men to commit those sins which he forbids. Yea, he works all things in all, even those which are sinful, and whatsoever he works, he works irresistibly. This may be illustrated by an example. God, by his efficacious decree and providence, compels a robber to commit homicide, as a king compels his subject to pay tribute, and as a rider rules his horse, forces, drives, impels him to move in whatever pace and direction he pleases.

r.—Think you, then, that with all your crimes you have been guilty of no sin?

Th.—Yea, I think I have sinned against the external will of God, but against his internal will, mind, and providence by no means, for the will of the divine good pleasure is accomplished when man sins against the commands of God.

Pr.—But you did not know nor think, that by your sins you were performing the internal and hidden will of God.

Th.—How, Mr. Preacher, could I think about this? Could I think any otherwise than I did think, with respect to divine providence and government? Had it been the hidden will and decree of God that I should think about it, it would have been out of my power to avoid the thought, but since it was not the internal will and decree of God, according to our doctrine, it formed no part of my cogitations. As soon as I felt a movement or incitement to any act which God, by his law forbids, forthwith the doubt entered my mind, whether it was not the internal and hidden will of God

that I should do it, and whether he did not drive and compel me, as his instrument, to accomplish that which by his internal and inevitable decree, he had determined should come to pass, suggesting such thoughts as these: if I resist I shall seem to rise in rebellion against God as the ally of Lucifer, and so and so wherever the impulse drove I rushed, and now I know to a certainty that it was the internal will and good pleasure of God that I should perpetrate whatever I have perpetrated; for without his internal will nothing of the kind could have ever happened. I will say farther, if at any time I reckoned more strictly with myself I burned with the greatest desire to accumulate and exaggerate my sins, foreseeing that by them I should render myself most acceptable to God. For, in truth, God, by reason of transgression, has the more room to manifest his glory, since he can have pity on the wretched only, and can justly condemn none but sinners, so that without transgression he could not effect his principal ends, the manifestation of his mercy in the salvation of those, and the manifestation of his justice in the destruction of these. Wherefore it was proper that man should fall from grace, that God might have cause and occasion to declare his justice and mercy. Sins serve the cause both of reprobation and predestination, for the reprobate are by them led to eternal destruction, and by them the predestinated illustrate the glory of God the more when they are rescued from them. Seeing then that sins were so acceptable to God, I, his creature, thought thus, and often groaned out this ejaculation, "Lord, behold thy servant still prepared to sin!"

Pr.—Nevertheless, my friend, have you always lived free from care and vexation?

Th.—Truly, I always preserved a cheerful mind, reasoning with myself thus:—If I am one of the elect, the spirit of Christ will work conversion and faith in me, with a power which, in the elect, is irresistible: for renovation is a creation which depends not on the will of man, but altogether on the will and power of God. As a dead man cannot raise himself from the dead, so from sin have I no power to rise, how much soever the word of God may be sounded in my ears, unless my spirit and life should be restored. Wherefore, it seemed to me most advisable to delay until God should come to dwell in me, and by his doctrines and ordinances move my heart; for where I am driven, thither I must proceed. On the other hand I concluded thus:—If I am reprobate, all the care and labour which I take for my salvation, and all the diligence which, perchance, I shall have exercised, will be in vain—nay, may be more injurious than beneficial. However much I may labour to do all that is done by the saints, I cannot be saved; so firm and immutable stands the purpose of God.

Pr.—You ought to have attended to vocation and invocation; when God by his word and spirit should call you.

Th.—How could I conduct myself in any other manner than I

did? He who is not called truly by the Gospel, and internally by the Holy Spirit, is not called according to the purpose of God: he cannot obey the call nor convert himself. God draws believers by an omnipotent operation which they have no power to resist. They are compelled, nor can they avoid following him who calls—namely, they in whom God dwells, and whose heart he moves by his ordinances.—This shall be illustrated by a similitude. As no one can prevent his nativity, nor hinder his resurrection from the dead; so can no one, by any means, prevent the operation of the grace of God in Christ, when by it he wishes to regenerate and raise us from spiritual death. Hence you clearly discern, if I had been effectually called, and drawn by God in this manner, I must have followed and obeyed.

Pr.—Did you never hear God calling, nor feel him moving you?

Th.—I heard him often. But you know well that as God has an external and an internal will; so has he also an external and an internal vocation. But the external vocation, if joined with the internal, is the work or effect of Predestination and its ineffable sign. This the Synod of Dort not long since clearly declared:—"But that some in *time* are gifted with faith by God, and that others are not gifted, proceeds from his eternal decree, according to which decree he graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however hard, and binds them to believe; but the non-elect, he leaves in just judgment, to their own perversity and hardness." You seem, then, Sir Preacher, to chatter frivolously and unbecomingly about these matters; chiding me, forsooth, as if I did not admit the vocation and invitation of God, fishing out of me, whether I heard not God calling and moving me! "Because some who are called by the ministry of the Gospel, come and are converted; that is not to be ascribed to man as if distinguishing himself, by free will, from others furnished with equal or sufficient grace for faith and conversion (which is the proud heresy of the Pelagians), but to God, who as he has elected his own in Christ from eternity, so he effectually calls them in time, gives them faith and repentance, and translates them, rescued from the power of darkness, into the kingdom of his Son. Yea, God works a regeneration and a new creation in us, and without our concurrence; and that by its own virtue is not less than, nor inferior to, creation or resurrection from the dead: so that all those in whose hearts God works in this admirable manner, are certainly, infallibly, and effectually, regenerated, and, in fact, believe." Wherefore do you accuse me for not being converted? That I may declare the fact, it stands thus:—I see not how it is possible that one who is always fluctuating and doubting whether he is one of the elect or of the reprobate, can conform himself to eternal vocation; or, moreover, this barrier being left, how internal vocation is not concurrent (with the external).

Pr.—Have you ever entertained the thought that you were one of the reprobate? Truly a dreadful thought!

Th.—I have entertained it, and not without cause: for God of his own good pleasure has reprobated the majority of men, and the reprobate are not reprobated on account of their transgressions, neither were his foreseen sins the cause of any man's reprobation; and it must necessarily be confessed, that evil works and unbelief were not the cause, since God of his own good counsel and will ordained that men, even from their birth, and in their mother's womb, are delivered to death, that his name may be glorified by their destruction. Revolving this in my mind, I often said silently to myself, "O God, thou best of beings! hast thou reprobated me with the majority of mankind? Easily, indeed, may I believe this; since such is thy delight in reprobation, that thy name may be glorified thereby!"

Pr.—This is indeed most true; that God from eternity, without any respect to sin, by his pure, absolute decree, which no man can understand, hath rejected the greater part of the human race, and hath created them for destruction; or in his immutable and inevitable decree, which he has with himself decreed, left them in the fall of Adam (to be damned)—yea, if one should say that God hates not any man, nor has decreed to hate any, as far as he is a man fashioned by himself, but only as a sinner, he contradicts the Apostle. You, however, should not harbour the idea that you are reprobate.

Th.—You say well. But how is it possible, that man whose faith has often to struggle with great temptations, and who is addicted to many sins, can easily imagine that he is not reprobate?—especially if he knows and considers with himself, that among the reprobates are not only the aged, but even infants—so that of dying infants some are saved and some damned, before they have done either good or evil. For the execution of the divine decree concerning reprobate infants stands thus:—As soon as they are born and die, they are eternally damned on account of original sin, which dwells in them; and because very many infants are called out of this life, and God snatches the little innocents from their mother's breasts and precipitates them into eternal death—(*i. e.* "torments in body and soul, without intermission in hell-fire for ever")—yea, more, God acts thus not only with the infants of Jews, Heathens, and Turks, but also with the baptized infants of Christian believers; so that some even of them dying in their infancy, are damned. For as to the certain salvation of all the children of believing parents that die in infancy, the word of God is silent. I venture to say still farther: when infants who die in Christ, before they could do either good or ill, are dealt with thus, they ought either to be saved by grace, or damned by nature, being children of wrath, as well as others. Truly, Sir Preacher, these are rigid reckonings for him who is bound to pay the bond. For these reasons, I am at a loss what to think on this topic.

Pr.—Hear, my friend. If a man has power and liberty to slay

an ox or a sheep for his own use, or to hunt and kill a hare or partridge for his pleasure—much more, without any injustice, is it placed in the will and liberty of the Creator to reject his own creature, and for his own glory forsake him. Yea, it would be a thousand times more just that all the creatures in heaven and earth should, by their destruction, serve to demonstrate the divine glory and majesty, than that the destruction of a fly, or the death of a flea, should serve to demonstrate the dignity of all the men on the face of the whole earth; and this doctrine is not to be condemned nor disapproved, but asserted—and the elect cannot but give thanks to God for reprobating the ungodly, since he has reprobated them for our salvation, and to testify with how great a love he burns for us. Yea, the reprobate themselves have nothing of which they can complain, but rather they should be thankful (for being damned)—for if they are fitted for destruction, God has so fitted them not in vain, but for illustrious ends, and chiefly for his own glory.

Th.—And this was the very reason, as I often thought with myself, for which it behoved us reprobates to be the more easily acquiescent; for although, if we regard only our private and peculiar good, it would be better not to be born than to be damned—nevertheless, on account of the public universal good, damnation is to be preferred: so that the peculiar may serve the universal, and the creature yield honour to the Creator. Therefore, although in the middle of summer, my nostrils were frozen up by the cold—nevertheless, I could smell this much of the future: that when we were hurled down to hell, to be held in chains and darkness for ever, we should be compelled to give thanks to God for having deigned to honour his creatures with such a holy servitude. Truly the dignity of God's chief glory and the benefit of election is so great, that those elected by his internal decree, and moved by the Holy Spirit, would wish to purchase the salvation of the reprobate of the Jews, were that possible, by their own ruin and damnation. O we reprobates, how are we thrice and four times blest!

Pr.—You seem to have devoted much labour and the whole acuteness of your genius to this doctrine of reprobation. It would have been better to have attended to the word and to preaching; and to have followed where they called.

Th.—I dispute it not. But while a sense of reprobation was impressed upon my brain, I often felt myself admonished to reflect that those whom God has eternally reprobated, even though God should call, cannot obey, nor believe, nor convert themselves, nor be justified, nor saved. They are not converted, because God does not wish for their conversion. Nay, to some of the reprobate congregated in his church he offers grace by his word, and often-times, also, by his ordinances—not that they may be saved, but on the contrary, that they may have less excuse, and in the end be more grievously punished.

Pr.—All these statements are true as truth itself. For as to

those whom God calls to the ignominy of life and the destruction of death, that they may be the instruments of his wrath and examples of his rigour, and that they may reach their appointed end, he deprives them of the power of hearing his word, and afterwards blinds them the more, and entangles them more inextricably by the preaching of the word. Oft-times, also, a faith is discovered in the reprobate, which has near cognation and affinity to the faith of the elect; and experience shows that they are moved by similar feelings and sentiments, insomuch that they frequently judge themselves to be among the chosen; and when it happens that some of them, by the aid of grace itself, are raised up that they may taste the celestial gift, and receive the seed of God—yea, when they seem to be incorporated as members of the church, and able to show to others the paths of salvation, and know not, and judge not otherwise of themselves than as of the elect, nevertheless, these unhappy men mount aloft, only that they may come down with a more grievous fall, and that God may afflict them with a more severe punishment.

Th.—That, indeed, I knew well; and therefore I shunned all exhortations, all religious assemblies, all readings of the word, and so avoided all good works that I might not be rendered more blind, be more entangled, and more grievously condemned. Yea, I asserted in express terms, that as it is not the purpose and sincere intention of God to lead to salvation those who are not called in their life, so was it not his mind and purpose to save the reprobate who are called, seeing that it does not please him to give them faith and repentance, without which they cannot be saved. God demands worship and obedience from all; but in this corrupt state he has decreed not to give the power of obedience to all. Of all to whom the word is preached, he demands faith; but to all he wills not that faith shall be given.

Pr.—You seem to have the doctrine of reprobation always deeply fixed in your mind.

Th.—Not always;—but ever and anon I have had cogitations of this kind; and often has it been my confirmed belief that I was truly one of the elect, and of this, even now, I entertain no doubt.

Pr.—Presume not to pronounce so boldly, nor confide too rashly that you are elect; since from your early years you have been of profligate and abandoned morals: nor have you, until this hour, made any change for the better—so that you have put forth but few of the good fruits of election.

Th.—My good sir, it is necessary you should know that the elect are not called immediately when they emerge from their mother's womb, nor all at the same time. Before they are gathered together to the great shepherd, they wander, scattered in a common wilderness, not separated by themselves, nor distinguished from the rest, unless they may be so guarded by the mercy of God as to be prevented from sliding into eternal death. Nor is God limited to any time, nor by any circumstance of life, in which he may call the

elect:—so that we can doubt of no man's salvation in whatever stage of life he may be, or in whatever course of iniquity his days may have been spent.—For no species of sin is so grievous as to hinder the celestial call. Whence it is clearer than the meridian sun, that on that account I am not immediately to despair, if I have not led a blameless life, as you seemed about to declare.

Pr.—Nevertheless it was your duty, as the apostle teaches, to make your salvation sure by good works.

Th.—How can such a foolish declaration have fallen from your lips, Mr. Preacher? Does our election depend on good works? I assert not; and will state for what reason I am fully persuaded of this: the elect themselves fall into the most enormous crimes, as adultery and homicide, and sometimes rush into such enormities as shake the grounds of salvation, and totally subvert them, sinning against conscience, and foully and heinously transgressing every commandment of God. But from all their transgressions they suffer no harm, for God does not wish to condemn his elect when they sin, since the basis of their salvation rests on eternal election; and a thousand sins, nay all the sins of the whole world, combined with all the devils in hell, cannot overturn their election. It may be that sins harden the heart and weaken faith, but they cannot take it away, nor totally extinguish the spirit, so that God condemns no man for his sins, who is adopted as his son in Christ Jesus.

Pr.—Had you no fear, then, of being damned, or of incurring the wrath of God?

Th.—I had no fear, not a particle: for they who are predestinated, cannot be rejected nor deserted for ever: once, because they are elected by the certain and immutable decree of God, and again, because they cannot be loved in Christ but for ever and ever.

Pr.—But you ought to have converted yourself and fashioned yourself according to the will of God that you might attain the remission of your sins.

Th.—You, as far as I can discern, think of the new Covenant as of the old, which was founded on legal sanctions, and conditional: thus: *if you should do this: if we believe: if we are constant and persevering, God would do so and so*, &c., which rule is diametrically opposed to the terms of the new Covenant. With us God establishes a new Covenant, and promises salvation to us not only without conditions, but when we are farthest removed from any, yea, whilst we are lying in the very midst of the death of sinners: behold God washes away and remits our sins before he renovates or regenerates the heart; and he does both before we have performed any good, even whilst we are defiled and profane his name. Here is the first budding forth of divine grace: God pursues all his elect, before they believe and repent, with his singular, eternal, gratuituous, and salvific love. Truly, as the holy Synod of Dort says, election is made not from any previous faith, or obedience of faith, sanctity, or any other good quality and disposition as the cause or condition

requisite in man's election, but unto faith, and unto the obedience of faith, holiness, &c. Therefore election is the fountain of every saving benefit, whence faith, holiness, and other salvific gifts, and eternal life itself, as its fruits and effects, flow forth.

Pr.—How long will you protract this discussion? Close your lips; refrain from disputing, recollect that the night is now far spent; you have but a short period to live. You should be desirous, then, to know by what means you can most surely be saved when you depart from this life. Reflect on the words of St. Paul (1 *Cor.* vi. 10), "Nor thieves nor robbers shall possess the kingdom of God." That however must be possessed if you are to be saved.

Th.—Do you think you can administer any medicine to my miserable soul?

Pr.—Believe in Jesus Christ; grieve for your sins; implore a happy end from God; and an hour in which he will grant you remission of sins and eternal life.

Th.—What must I believe that I may have a right belief in Christ?

Pr.—You must believe that Jesus Christ on your account by his death and passion merited the remission of sins with eternal life. This is enjoined in the Gospel.

Th.—Are whatever things the Gospel enjoins true or false?

Pr.—Truth itself.

Th.—Has Christ by his passion and death acquired those blessings in behalf of all?

Pr.—However much human reason even in the pious is scandalized, and some teachers of evangelical doctrine make a sad bluster, and rage like bacchanals, when they hear it said that God wills not that all but only a certain number shall be saved, and also that Christ died not for all; nevertheless we hold a firm belief in both of these doctrines, depending on the surest words of Scripture, insomuch that I can affirm in express terms that God has appointed no mediator for the reprobate. Christ is the Redeemer of the elect alone and of none beside.

Th.—Did not Christ die to make atonement for the reprobate?

Pr.—I beseech you, if you are an elect little sheep of Christ, why do you patronize the reprobate and the damned? Read the judgment of the Synod of Dort, and it will teach you that this was the most free counsel of God the Father and his most gracious will and intention,—that the verifying and salvific efficacy of the most precious death of his Son should put itself forth to all the elect, to give to them alone justifying faith, and by it infallibly conduct them to salvation. That is, God willed that Christ through the blood of the cross, by which he confirmed the new Covenant, should effectually redeem from every people, tribe, nation, and language, all those, and those alone, who were from eternity elected to salvation and given to him by the Father, and that he should endow them with faith and other saving gifts of the Holy Spirit, which he acquired for them by his death.

Th.—Are all men elected?

Pr.—By no means; for God of his own mere good pleasure, without any respect to their future impiety, ordained the greatest part of the human race to eternal perdition.

Th.—Tell me, then, seriously and in good faith, whom do you think me—elect or reprobate? Answer—or do you doubt? Speak plainly and do not wrap up your answer in the integuments of words—let not your tongue be at variance with your heart, but let there be concord between your heart and lips, and speak as you think, candidly and openly. It is necessary that I should know this: if I am reprobate I should believe a lie, for Christ acquired nothing for the sake of the reprobate. If I am elect I shall follow the truth and not falsehoods. But, in fine, to seek the truth is the work of the Gospel. Before all things I would know whether I am elect or not.

Pr.—Every one of the church of God is bound to believe that he is redeemed by Christ, reprobate and elect alike; each however in a peculiar mode. The elect is bound to believe, that as a believer he becomes a partaker of election; the reprobate as believing from the intention of God, has so much the less for which he can answer, and so Christ is offered to the reprobate not that they may be saved, but that, being convicted by their unbelief and their own refractory heart, they may want all excuse.

Th.—Is this your meaning? That God wishes the reprobate to believe a lie, yea, to punish them with eternal damnation, because they do not believe a lie; what hinders it from being so?—After God has passed a damnatory sentence on the reprobate, it is all the same in whatever mode he may damn them.

Pr.—Let us leave these subtleties, I entreat you, and pray to God that he may grant you eternal salvation.

Th.—If you wish to pray, pray for yourself. I have no inclination to lose my labour by praying in vain. If I am reprobate, I could not obtain salvation though I should spend a thousand years in prayer. For reprobation stands firm and immovable, so that as the elect cannot be reprobated, neither can the reprobate be rendered elect. Reprobation is as immutable on the part of God who reprobates, as on the part of men who are reprobated. What, then, can prayers profit? On the contrary, if I am elect, God from eternity has destined me to salvation, and all who were ordained to salvation before the creation of the world, are led to it by the power of God, that the purpose of election may stand fast, so firmly and certainly that it is impossible they can be damned or perish—and this was always my belief, and according to it I walked. The Synod of Dort confirmed me in the faith so strongly that I would rather have been burned than depart from it a hair's breadth. It expressly asserts, as God himself is immutable, omniscient and omnipotent, so election made by him cannot be interrupted, nor changed, nor revoked, nor broken; nor can the elect be rejected nor their number diminished. Granting, moreover, that the elect, by divine permission, sometimes fall into grievous and

atrocious sins, as David, Peter, and other holy men, and that they offend God by their enormous transgressions, incur the guilt of death, grieve the Holy Spirit, interrupt the exercise of faith most grievously, wound the conscience, and for some time lose the sense of grace; God, nothwithstanding, by his immutable decree of election, does not take away his Holy Spirit from them even in those sad lapses, nor does he suffer them to fall from the grace of adoption, and the state of justification, or to commit the sin unto death, or the sin against the Holy Ghost, so that being deserted by him they may precipitate themselves into eternal perdition. Not by their own merits or strength, but by the gratuitous mercy of God they obtain this—that they do not fall entirely from faith and grace, nor finally remain and perish in their backslidings. This, as to themselves indeed is not so easily done, though undoubtedly it should be done, but as to God it cannot be done at all, for his counsel is not to be changed, nor his promise broken, nor the call according to his purpose revoked, nor the merits of Christ, his intercession, his guardianship, rendered vain, nor the seal of the Holy Spirit frustrated or blotted out. Nay, what is more, since reprobation is the internal and eternal operation of God which in reality differs not from the essence of God, we need have no discussion about election; but this only will I say, it is granted and confessed by all that reprobation as well as election differs not from the essence of God, and since it is very God who is himself immutable, far be it from me to make any prayer that God may be changed.

Pr.—Good God! How abominable to hear such expressions. Is it possible that man can proceed to such a pitch of impiety as to be unwilling to invoke thy name, loaded as he is with sins and miseries?

Th.—I would rather sing, Mr. Preacher, until the chamber would resound, that very beautiful hymn written by Bernard Bischop, formerly a preacher in Gueldria, now in Utrecht, in Holland.

Pr.—If he wrote that hymn he must have been a good man, for he is a preacher of the orthodox doctrine. Let me hear it.

Th.—Listen attentively. The tune will answer to that of the 103rd Psalm. You will perceive in its brief and popular style my universal standard and rule of faith, according to which I have resolved to live and die.

HYMN.

I.

May God be blessed—who, ere the earth
Was formed, or I had sprung to birth,
By his immutable decree,
To endless life predestined me;
Not for my faith which he foresaw,
Or works obedient to his law,
But solely of his boundless grace
To me, and all th' elected race.

II.

May God be blessed—whose counsel true
Me to himself for ever drew,
By his pure word to sense addrest,
And by his spirit in my breast.
My nature—sinful, vile, obscene—
He purified, and made me clean;
And daily on my darkened sight
He pours his clear and holy light.

III.

My blind, depraved, and erring will,
Debauched and prone to malice still,
He freed from sin's infernal yoke,
And all its ties asunder broke.
Since now the paths to heaven are known
I joy to walk in them alone.
Oh! had I power I ne'er would stray
One moment from the perfect way.

IV.

May God be blessed—whose holy word
And spirit joined in sweet accord,
Together work with potent art,
Firm faith implanting in my heart—
Such faith, such trust, so firm, so strong,
A faith to which such powers belong
That though fierce storms its strength may shake,
And bend, they vainly strive to break.

V.

Who, from the path of truth and grace,
Can e'er seduce God's chosen race?
From Christ my spirit who can charm?
Who snatch me from his potent arm?
No devil, death, nor mortal sin
Work with such potency within,
By force or fraud from me to rend
The faith on which my hopes depend.

VI.

God, who in me his work began,
Will surely perfect make his plan;
Will in his mercy still attend,
And bring it to a happy end;
Yea, to this wretched life's last hour
Will guard me by his mighty power;
And, by his spirit at my side,
Through life to his salvation guide.

Gaoler.—Have done, I say—I will hear these disputations and psalm-singings no longer. That is such a rhyme as becomes a felon; and it is worthy to be sung by a choir of the most abandoned villains. Your life and doctrine have an admirable correspondence.

Th.—You may vituperate, Mr. Gaoler, as much as you please. I think that hymn is excellent: and if I must die, I will sing it at the gallows in place of *Ex-profundis Domine*. The preacher who composed this hymn is one of the orthodox contra-remonstrants who, not long since, was called out of a small village to the city of Utrecht, in Holland—who for the hymn answered abundantly, and so defended it, that it was received into the oxthodox church as being consentaneous to the holy Scriptures.

Gaoler.—Is this the same orthodox doctrine that has created such disturbance in these provinces; and which, that it may be held in unison with the holy church, depends on the authority of a synod, and the power of the sword? Truly, it is something delicately refined!

Pr.—It would be becoming in you, Gaoler, to close your mouth on these subjects, which are beyond your comprehension. Beware of what you say; and cease to calumniate, lest it go ill with you, and ere long you be deprived of your authority in the prison.

Gaoler.—If these be your best arguments, Sir Preacher, your doctrine is not over-well established. But, however you may threaten, I will, nevertheless, utter what I ought. You may know well that I perceive your counsel has little effect in leading the prisoner to true repentance, and converting him from his sins. Yea, by the dogmas of men of your description, he is rendered only more obdurate. I have heard much of the heads of your dogmas, but never could I believe them till now, that I have been an eye and ear-witness of all the abominations that have fallen from your mouth. Can such indeed be the doctrines of the Reformation? It should be called, what it really is, *Deformation*. Of itself it is able to operate and effect nothing, but to excite a false security and stimulate men to persevere in their iniquities. Wherefore, Preacher, since by your doctrine you can give no relief to this sick patient, you had better take your departure, and I will bring another with a lighted lantern, contradicting your arguments and giving a different sense to religion, who, I think, will lead far more easily and certainly to sorrow for sin and to reformation of life.

Pr.—Act as you please; but be assured you shall not act with impunity.

Gaoler.—Do what you can. It is of far more importance to me to save the soul of this man, than to have the good will of a thing like you. In the mean time, indulge your malevolence and rancour till you are weary. Good night.

Note.—Were it necessary, it could be shown by volumes of evidence, that the doctrines of Calvinism and their consequences are even more shocking and disgusting than they are represented in the preceding dialogue. The reader's attention is particularly requested to

the following extract from the second volume of *Southey's "Life of Wesley," pp.* 384—391, where it is quoted, and affirmed to be "one of the most able and eloquent of all Wesley's Discourses; a triumphant specimen of empassioned argument."

"Call it by whatever name you please," said he, attacking the Calvinistic doctrine, "Election, Preterition, Predestination, or Reprobation, it comes to the same thing. The sense is plainly this: by virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, one part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned, it being impossible that any of the former should be damned, or that any of the latter should be saved." He proceeded to show that it made all preaching vain, as needless to the elect, and useless to the reprobate, and therefore that it could not be a doctrine of God, because it makes void his ordinances: that it tended to produce spiritual pride in some, absolute despair in others, and to destroy our zeal for good works: that it made revelation contradictory and useless; and that it was full of blasphemy,—"of such blasphemy," said he, "as I should dread to mention, but that the honour of our gracious God, and the cause of truth, will not suffer me to be silent. In the cause of God," he pursues, "and from a sincere concern for the glory of his great name, I will mention a few of the horrible blasphemies contained in this horrible doctrine. But, first, I must warn every one of you that hears, as he will answer at the great day, not to charge me, as some have done, with blasphemy, because I mention the blasphemy of others. And the more you are grieved with them that do thus blaspheme, see that ye 'conform your love towards them' the more, and that your heart's desire, and continual prayer to God be, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

"This premised, let it be observed, that this doctrine represents our blessed Lord, 'Jesus Christ the righteous, the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth,' as an hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity. For it cannot be denied that he every where speaks as if he were willing that all men should be saved; therefore, to say he was not willing that all men should be saved, is to represent him as a mere hypocrite and dissembler. It cannot be denied, that the gracious words which came out of his mouth are full of invitations to all sinners; to say, then, he did not *intend* to save all sinners, is to represent him as a gross deceiver of the people. You cannot deny that he says, 'Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden.' If, then, you say he calls those that cannot come, those whom he knows to be unable to come, those whom he can make able to come, but will not, how is it possible to describe greater insincerity? You represent him as mocking his helpless creatures, by offering what he never intends o give. You describe him as saying one thing and meaning another; as pretending the love which he had not. Him in whose mouth was no guile, you make full of deceit, void of common sincerity: then,

especially when drawing nigh the city, he wept over it, and said, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, and ye would not!' Now if you say *they would* but *he would not* you represent him (which who could hear?) as weeping crocodile tears over the prey which he has doomed to destruction!

"Such blasphemy as this, one would think, might make the ears of a Christian to tingle! But there is yet more behind; for, just as it honours the Son, so doth this doctrine honour the Father. It destroys all his attributes at once: it overturns both justice, mercy, and truth. Yes, it represents the Most Holy God as worse than the devil, as more false, more cruel, and more unjust. More false, because the devil, liar as he is, hath never said he willeth all mankind to be saved; more unjust, because the devil cannot if he would, be guilty of such injustice as you ascribe to God, when you say, that God condemned millions of souls to everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels, for continuing in sin, which, for want of that grace which *he will not* give them, they cannot avoid; and more cruel, because that unhappy spirit 'secketh rest and findeth none,' so that his own restless misery is a kind of temptation to him to tempt others. But God 'resteth in his high and holy place,' so that to suppose him out of mere motion, of his pure will and pleasure, happy as he is, to doom his creatures, whether they will or not, to endless misery, is to impute such cruelty to him, as we cannot impute even to the great enemy of God and man. It is to represent the most high God (he that hath ears to hear let him hear,) as 'more cruel, false, and unjust, than the devil.'

"This is the blasphemy clearly contained in the *horrible decree* of Predestination. And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every asserter of it. You represent God as worse than the devil; more false, more cruel, more unjust. But you say you will prove it by Scripture. Hold! What will you prove by Scripture? that God is worse than the devil? It cannot be. Whatever the Scripture proves, it never proves this: whatever be its true meaning, it cannot mean this. Do you ask, what is its true meaning then? If I say, I know not, you have gained nothing; for there are many scriptures, the true sense whereof neither you nor I shall know, till death is swallowed up in victory. But this I know, better it were to say it had no sense at all, than to say it had such sense as this. It cannot mean, whatever it mean beside, that the God of truth is a liar. Let it mean what it will, it cannot mean that the judge of all the world is unjust. No scripture can mean that God is not love, or that his mercy is not over all his works: that is, whatever it prove beside, no scripture can prove predestination.

"This is the blasphemy for which I abhor the doctrine of Predestination; a doctrine, upon the supposition of which, if one could possibly suppose it for a moment, call it election, reprobation, or what you please, (for it all comes to the same thing) one might say

to our adversary the devil, 'Thou fool, why dost thou roar about any longer? Thy lying in wait for souls is as needless and useless as our preaching. Hearest thou not, that God hath taken thy work out of thy hands, and that he doth it more effectually? Thou, with all thy principalities and powers, canst only so assault that we may resist thee; but he can irresistibly destroy both soul and body in hell! Thou canst only entice; but his unchangeable decree to leave thousands of souls in death, compels them to continue in sin, till they drop into everlasting burnings. Thou temptest; he forceth us to be damned, for we cannot resist his will. Thou fool! why goest thou about any longer, seeking whom thou mayest devour? Hearest thou not that God is the devouring lion, the destroyer of souls, the murderer of men? Moloch caused only children to pass through the fire, and that fire was soon quenched; or, the corruptible body being consumed, its torments were at an end; but God, thou art told, by his eternal decree fixed, before they had done good or evil, causes not only children of a span long, but the parents also, to pass through the fire of hell; that fire which never shall be quenched: and the body which is cast thereinto, being now incorruptible and immortal, will be ever consuming and never consumed; but the smoke of their torment, because it is God's good pleasure, ascendeth up for ever.'

"Oh, how would the enemy of God and man rejoice to hear these things were so. How would he lift up his voice, and say, To your tents, O Israel! flee from the face of this God, or ye shall utterly perish. But whither will ye flee? Into heaven? He is there. Down to hell? He is there also. Ye cannot flee from an omnipresent, almighty tyrant. And whether ye flee or stay, I call heaven, his throne, and earth, his footstool, to witness against you; ye shall all perish, ye shall die eternally! Sing, O hell, and rejoice, ye that are under the earth! for God, even the mighty God, hath spoken, and devoted thousands of souls, from the rising of the sun, to the going down thereof. Here, O death, is thy sting. They shall not, cannot escape, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. Here, O grave, is thy victory: nations yet unborn, or ever they have done good or evil, are doomed never to see the light of life, but thou shalt gnaw upon them for ever and ever. Let all those morning stars sing together who fell with Lucifer, son of the morning! Let all the sons of hell shout for joy, for the decree is past, and who shall annul it?

"Yes! the decree is past, and so it was before the foundation of the world. But what decree? even this; 'I will set before the sons of men life and death, blessing and cursing;' and 'the soul that chooseth life shall live, and the soul that chooseth death shall die!' This decree, whereby whom God 'did foreknow, he did predestinate,' was indeed from everlasting: this, whereby all who suffer Christ to make them alive, are 'elect according to the foreknowledge of God; now standeth fast, even as the moon, and the faithful witness in heaven, and when heaven and earth shall pass away, yet this shall

not pass away, for it is as unchangeable and eternal as the being of God that gave it. This decree yields the strongest encouragement to abound in all good works, and in all holiness; and it is a well-spring of joy, of happiness also, to our great and endless comfort. This is worthy of God. It is every way consistent with the perfection of his nature. It gives us the noblest view both of his justice, mercy, and truth. To this agrees the whole scope of the Christian Revelation, as well as all the parts thereof. To this Moses and all the prophets bear witness; and our blessed Lord and all his apostles. Thus Moses, in the name of his Lord, 'I call heaven and earth to record against you this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing, therefore choose life, that thou and thy seed may live.' Thus Ezekiel (to cite one prophet for all), 'The soul that sinneth it shall die; the son shall not bear (eternally) the iniquity of the father. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.' Thus our blessed Lord, 'If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink.' Thus his great apostle, St. Paul, 'God commandeth all men, every where to repent.' *All men, every where;* every man, in every place, without any exception, either of place or person. Thus St. James, 'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given unto him.' Thus St. Peter, 'The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.' And thus St. John, 'If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.'

"O! hear ye this, ye that forget God? Ye cannot charge your death upon him. 'Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God. Repent and turn from all your transgressions, so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God. Wherefore, turn yourselves, and live ye.'—'As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?' "

After quoting this "memorable passage, the most remarkable and the most powerful in all his works," (Wesley's), Southey informs us that "it exasperated, beyond measure, those who in their own conceit, had taken out their patent of election, and considered themselves, in Mr. Toplady's language, (himself one of the number), as kings *incog*, travelling, disguised, like pilgrims, to their dominions above. * * It is indeed in a tremendous strain of eloquence, and shows with what indignation the preacher, in his zeal for God, and in his love for his fellow creatures, regarded a doctrine so injurious to both."

FINIS.

REV. C. H. SPURGEON'S

TWO BRIDGES OF CALVINISM

AND ARMINIANISM.

BY

THE REV. DANIEL MACAFEE.

BELFAST:
GEORGE PHILLIPS & SON;
LONDON: A. HEYLIN, 23, PATERNOSTER ROW; DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON, 3, GRAFTON STREET.

1858.

REV. C. H. SPURGEON'S

TWO BRIDGES OF CALVINISM & ARMINIANISM.

FIRST LETTER.

My Dear Young Friend,—You seem very anxious to ascertain my opinion of the Rev. Mr. Spurgeon, and the dogmas he so boldly announced to the community in his sermons lately preached in Belfast, and now published at large. To give it publicly, I can form no objection, but what arises from the high respect I entertain for many Ministers and laymen, who may, at least in part, approve of the sentiments he advanced. Several of these are among the excellent of the earth, having hearts filled with faith and love—principles which develope themselves in zeal for the glory of God and the benefit of the whole human family. However, I may differ from such in minor points, I cannot but esteem them in love for their works' sake; and hence, I shrink from giving offence to the generation of God's children. I trust, nevertheless, this will not be the result—that the same right to think, speak, and publish, which good men accord to Mr. Spurgeon, though a young man, will not be denied to one who has something of age and experience, and who, if he judges rightly, ought to be fully as well acquainted with the subject in hand as one who is but a student of yesterday. I am happy to find I cannot give offence to Mr. Spurgeon himself, seeing he declares, in his first sermon, that "it does not signify to me the turn of a finger what any man existing chooses to think of me." This relieves my mind greatly in appearing before the public. This is, certainly, a very independent declaration. It equally sets the scorn of an enemy and the sympathy of a friend aside. It seems to set the world at defiance. It would, therefore, be a work of supererogation for any friend to sympathise or offer assistance to one so careless, reckless, independent, and even infallible; and thus cast a reflection on his wisdom and sincerity in giving utterance to the conscious sense he entertains of his own gigantic strength and position. Dr. Johnson said of "Gulliver's Travels," "It defies criticism, because there is nothing else in the world to which it can be compared." It would seem as if Mr. Spurgeon entertains the same notion of himself. Dean Swift thought the man who talked in this style was a mere braggadocio. The celebrated Doctor just named considered the individual not sufficiently endued with wisdom, who dissents from

the universal sense of mankind, and affects to despise public opinion. The pinions, or opinions, of this young man are so strong, and his flight so high, that he has no fear of a shot, even from a Minie rifle. While he looks down with indifference on all below, a tinge of modesty might have prevented him from giving utterance to the sentiment now quoted. It would appear, however, that this commodity was scarcer in the region of his birth than Tyrian dye was among the ancients. That he is possessed of talent, no one can deny; but, like a wild colt, it requires training. It refuses the bit and bridle of regular discipline, and raises clouds of dust by eccentric movements. A sturdy intellect, a retentive memory, a luxuriant imagination, a simple Saxon style of words, a familiar mode of address, a knack of telling old and new stories, and a large stock of the most consummate effrontery, that any young man ever possessed, constitute the nucleus of his popularity among the high and low vulgar, such as attend his ministry in the Surrey Gardens. His voice is loud, clear, and distinct—not a word is lost to his audience; and his whole ministration seems to be a medium between the stage and the pulpit. At one time he depicts the Father and Son holding a dialogue from eternity about the elect; at another, Justice and Mercy are engaged in the same manner; and perhaps, in the same discourse a dialogue takes place between Tommy and Jenny. In one sentence he is an apostle, in another a poor sinner. To-day he is little David, with a sling and a stone going forth to meet Goliah; and to-morrow he will appear as Goliah himself, with a staff and a spear, bidding defiance to all opposers. Some of his audience are astounded, others seem edified, and many are amused. Thus one thinks him inspired, another says he is an original, a third says he is much indebted to the Puritan authors, and a fourth is shocked at his familiarity with things sacred and divine, and charges him with inordinate self-conceit. It is not for me to say who is right or who is wrong in his estimate of the man. It is rather my object at present to point out the injurious tendencies of his dogmas and misrepresentations.

My dear young friend, I wish you seriously to consider your position and relative influence in society, and especially on the rising generation; you are, I believe, heartily identified with the Wesleyan Church, having received a change of heart through the means which it furnishes; you are a member of the Young Men's Association, under the guidance of the Minister stationed on your circuit; you are a distributor of tracts, and a teacher in a large and important Sunday-school. It is therefore of the utmost importance that you should have settled principles: ones that will always terminate in good and practical results. The Apostle furnishes a rule of judgment, by which you need never mistake. Here it is: "The *doctrine* which is *according* to *godliness*." How is this applied? In this way. Take any doctrine, dogma, or opinion whatsoever, and ask yourself the question, what is the tendency or result it is calculated to produce? Will it terminate in *godliness?* Will it make our thoughts, words, or actions *like God?* If it has not this tendency, discard it at once; it does not come from God, and hence cannot lead to Him or His image in the soul. All doctrine revealed by God must have a God-like influence that assimilates to Himself. Hence, there is not one speculative doctrine revealed in the Holy Scripture; all is experimental and practical. Anything proposed in the shape of doctrine that is useless, frivolous, absurd, or that leads the mind into mere speculations, without

flowing into personal and appropriating faith in Christ, love to God and mankind, and the final conversion of the world, cannot possibly be from God. It is but a puff of Satan's breath, a mere "wind of doctrine," a cloud without rain, a well without water, and a tree without fruit; it bears the vine of Sodom, and the grapes of Gomorrah. Hence the necessity of trying all doctrines by this rule, plainly laid down by God himself. True, the mind may be puzzled by knowing parties whose fruit is good, while principles are entertained that are not evidently in accordance with this rule; but you must take into account that such possess good principles, that neutralise the evil ones, and therefore they will always be better than their creed. Besides, false principles are imaginary, and the good Spirit of God operates on the settled faculties and affections, so that imagination is cooled down in the conversion of the heart and the fruits of holiness that result. Apply this rule to the *peculiar* doctrines of Calvinism and Arminianism. There are principles common to both. Never mind these in the present subject which we have in hand; pass by the universal corruption resulting from the fall of man, justification by faith, the indwelling of the Spirit, and His various fruits, holiness of heart and life, and the doctrine of reward and punishment; these are *common* to *both*. Confine your mind *exclusively* to the *first* and *peculiar principles* of *both systems*. If you find the *Arminian creed* sets the *common principles aside*, then *have done* with *it; it* is *not according* to *godliness*. If, on the other hand, the *peculiar principles* of *Calvinism* have *no tendency* to *godliness*, set them aside as *vain* and *imaginary*.

Try Mr. Spurgeon's peculiar dogmas by this rule. Never mind the excellencies—the common principles which he advanced. These are common to all evangelical parties: attend to his peculiar dogmas. Pass by his confident manner and figurative language, and look at the marrow of his teaching. He comes to Belfast, and is heard by thousands. His first sermon in Dr. Cooke's Church is rather unexceptionable. He invites, persuades, points out the way of salvation, and leaves you to think it is free for all. In fact, he there seemed to belong to the Church universal; and a Primitive Methodist might have mistaken him for the man who was instrumental in his conversion, if he had not heard the story. "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God," was his text. It had the same object in view as John Wesley's on "the almost Christian," though greatly inferior in arrangement, Scriptural knowledge, and critical acumen, to the Fellow of Oxford College. Observe, I make no comparison between one and the other. Wesley was a scholar, a logician, a poet, and a man of taste. His next discourse was on "Heaven," about the one hundred and forty and four thousand that stood with the Lamb on Mount Zion. According to him, *not one can be added, not one lost*. What, then, is the use of his preaching? His next is on "the True Seekers," in which he gives a glowing, or rather dark, description of a reprobate. He is a man "that has not a friend anywhere." God, angels, the elect in heaven and earth, the very hills, valleys, trees, fields, and all kinds of beasts, are his enemies; and why? Because he is a sinner, and does not belong to "the definite number." In this he announces the doctrine of election, of which so "many are afraid," Fools that they are! for, if elected, they are saved; if not they are lost. Fear, therefore, is useless in both cases. Why, then, did God implant a useless passion in the human mind? and why torment both elect and reprobate before the time? Does God delight in misery? His fourth

sermon, in the Botanic Garden, completes the course. "Thou shalt call His name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins." In this he attacks free-will, as if he had none of his own! gives a taste of imputed sin and righteousness; decries Antinomianism as the fruit, and yet waters its root; characterises Christian perfection as hump-backed; preaches up final perseverance, and finally illustrates the whole by stating, *ex cathedra*, that "Arminianism is a very broad bridge, but it only goes halfway across the stream, and shoves the people out. Calvinism is a narrow bridge, but it goes the whole way. Let them put their foot on it, and they are secure. Give them a firm footing at the first, and they shall have a firm footing to the end. They shall never perish, neither shall any person pluck them out of the Saviour's hands." I feel obliged to Mr. Spurgeon for this illustration. It is capital. I would ask no better. In the meantime, can an erection be called a bridge that reaches only halfway? If this figure be worth anything, it means, first, that none of the elect are on the Arminian bridge; and, secondly, that all on it perish; for when halfway it "shoves them" into perdition. Such is Mr. Spurgeon's charitable judgment in relation to Arminians! Could he not have saved at least a few of them by sending them along his own narrow bridge, and thus save them in their ignorance? Are there no Arminians, or Wesleyans, who personally believe in Christ? His illustration says not. Is this according to Godlike love? I am sure it is not. If this be the spirit of his gospel, I hope he will have few imitators. Surely there might be some Arminians on his iron bridge who fancy, that, like the ark, it is made of gopher wood. The Papist claims exclusive salvation, and he does the same. His charity (or want of it) would be a capital qualification for an inquisitor. It would suit the cell, the pulley, the thumbscrew, and the sanbonatto painted with flames and devils. This was the frock in which the *reprobate* martyrs were burned to death by the holy Inquisitors at an *Auto da fe*. Perhaps Mr. Spurgeon's heart is better than his imagination. It drowns both his logic and charity. He is but a young man, and a still younger divine, and it is not improbable that his boyish imagination lifted his creed while he played at hop-step-and-jump. It is now time for him to revise it; and in doing so, I would not feel astonished if he would ultimately sprinkle his neighbours' children; and erect a statue to the shade of the great and learned Arminius. Napoleon's new battering-ram will be nothing to the one he will then bring against Calvin's iron bridge. The thundering noise of every stroke will reverberate from Surrey Gardens, throw down half of the houses in London, and blow up the Crystal Palace.

Let us now turn back to the two bridges—that of Calvin and that of Arminius. You may not be well acquainted with the architecture of either, and it is my duty at present to place each before you. You may then judge which is human or which Divine. They stand professedly on different butments, and each in common has five arches, called by some divines the five points. You are not to fancy that there are actually two bridges; for if the one be real, the other is imaginary—the one is but the shadow of the other, seen in the deep broad waters. Each of them, according to its author, was planned in eternity. The Scriptures alone contain the draft and design, and must determine which is the original, and which the spurious, invention. It would be unbecoming either candour or honesty to give you a second-hand sketch of my own, when the originals are at hand. As Calvin's name is

engraven on the one and that of Arminius on the other, it may be best to let each, or their most judicious followers, give the description. Let the great and the world-wide famed Calvin speak for himself. He does not descend to describe the arches minutely. He speaks of the bridge as a whole, and leaves the particulars to minor men like Mr. Spurgeon. If I don't mistake, he has but *one* butment—namely, the sovereignty of God. In this case, it is something like those drawbridges—that is, moved in or out of its place as the elect or reprobate come forward. When the elect approaches it is fixed and steady ; but when the reprobate draws near it moves on an invisible spring and leaves a chasm. Mr. Spurgeon invites all to try, finds great fault with those who do not, and yet he tells us, in effect, if one not in the hundred and forty and four thousand makes the attempt, he may sink into perdition while one foot is on the bridge and the other off. The master now speaks ; let the scholars listen. The great author of Calvinism says :—

1. " *Predestination* we call the *eternal decree* of God, by which he hath *determined* in *himself* what he would have to become of *every individual of mankind*. For they are *not* all *created* with a *similar destiny ;* but *eternal life* is *fore-ordained* for *some*, and *eternal damnation* for *others*. *Every man*, therefore, being *created* for *one* or the *other* of these *ends*, we say he is *predestinated* either to *life* or to *death*."*

2. " As *Jacob*, without any merit yet acquired by good works, is made an *object of grace*, so *Esau*, while *yet unpolluted* by *any crime*, is *accounted* an *object of hatred*. If we turn our attention to works, we insult the Apostle, as though he saw not that which is clear to us. Now, that he saw none is evident, because he expressly asserts the *one* to have been *elected* and the other *reprobated*, while they had *not yet* done *any good or evil*, to prove the foundation of Divine predestination not to be of works."†

3. " When the human mind hears these things its petulance breaks all restraint, and it discovers a serious and violent agitation, as if alarmed by the sound of a martial trumpet. Many, indeed, as if they wished to avert odium from God, admit election in such a way as to deny that any are reprobated. But this is puerile and absurd; because election itself could not exist without being opposed to reprobation. God is said to separate those whom he adopts to salvation. To say that others obtain by chance, or acquire by their own efforts, that which election alone confers on a few, will be worse than absurd. Whom God passes by, therefore, he reprobates, and from no other cause than his determination to exclude them from the inheritance which he predestinates for his children. But, now, we have heard that hardening proceeds from the Divine power and will as much as mercy. Unlike the persons I have mentioned, Paul never strives to excuse God by false allegations ; he only declares that it is unlawful for a thing formed to quarrel with its maker. Let the reader observe that, to preclude every pretext for murmurs and censures, Paul ascribes supreme dominion to the wrath and power of God. This, however, I maintain, which is observed by Augustine, that, when God turns wolves into sheep, he renovates them by more

---

* Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion, translated by Allen. Book III., Chap. 21, Sec. 5.

† Chap. xxii., 11.

powerful grace to conquer their obstinacy; and, therefore, the obstinate are not converted, because God exerts not the mightier grace, of which he is not destitute if he chooses to display it."*

4. "Observe: all things being at God's disposal, and the decision of salvation or death belonging to Him, He orders all things by his counsel or decree in such a manner that some men are born, devoted from the womb to certain death, that he may be glorified in their destruction."†

5. "The perplexity and hesitation discovered at trifles by those pious defenders of the justice of God (observe, he speaks ironically), and their facility in overcoming great difficulties, is truly absurd. Imagine, again, how it came to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations, with their infant children, in *eternal death*, but because such was the will of God. Their tongues, so loquacious on every other point, must here be struck dumb. It is an *awful decree*, I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future, final fate of man before he created him, and that He did foreknow it because it was appointed by His own decree."‡

Such, my young friend, is the sketch drawn by the masterly hand of Calvin himself, in reference to the bridge—the narrow bridge without a hole—of which Mr. Spurgeon makes his boast. He may try to paint or polish its irons, and make it as pleasing to the eye as possible; but as Calvin denominates it awful or horrible, so we may call it the bridge of horrors. Calvin tells us that God foreknows because He decreed. The Apostle says, Rom. viii., 29, that He predestinated because He foreknows. This makes an essential difference. This bridge, however, has its arches. These are delineated by the followers of that great man. The Synod of Dordt sat in 1618, and gives them to us as reported by Dr. Womack, in the trial of Tilenus. The Arminians appeared there as remonstrants, and exhibited their bridge and its arches, as recorded by Mosheim. Let us place the two in juxtaposition, so that you may judge of the one by comparing it with the other. The simple question will then be, which of the two is worthy of the skill, goodness, mercy, and love of the Divine Architect?

Arches of Calvinism.	Arches of Arminianism.
1. That God, by an absolute decree, hath elected to salvation a very little number of men, without any regard to their faith or obedience whatsoever; and [hath] secluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind, and appointed them, by the same decree, to eternal damnation, without any regard to their infidelity or impenitency.	1. That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw would persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus; and to inflict everlasting punishment on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist unto the end His divine succours.
2. That Jesus Christ hath not suffered death for any other, but for those elect only; having neither had any interest nor commandment of his	2. That Jesus Christ, by his death and suffering, made an atonement for the sins of all mankind in general, and of every individual in particular;

* Chap. xxiii., Sec. 1. † Sec. 4. ‡ Sec. 7.

Father to make satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

3. That, by Adam's fall, his *posterity* lost their *free-will*, being put to an *unavoidable necessity to do*, or *not* to *do*, *whatsoever* they *do*, or *do not*, whether it be *good* or *evil*, being *themselves predestinate* by the *eternal* and *effectual secret decree of God*.

4. That God, to save his *elect* from the *corrupt mass*, doth *beget faith* in them by a *power* equal to *that* whereby he *created* the *world* and *raised* up the *dead;* insomuch that *such* unto whom he gives *that grace cannot reject* it; and the *rest*, being *reprobate*, *cannot accept* of it, though it be *offered* unto *both* by the *same preaching* and *ministry*.

5. That such as have *once* received that *grace* by *faith can never* fall from it *finally* nor *totally*, notwithstanding the *most enormous sins* they *can commit*.

that, however, none but those who believe in Him can be partakers of their divine benefit.

3. That *true faith cannot proceed* from the *exercise* of *our natural faculties* and *powers*, nor from the *force* and *operation* of *free-will*, since man, in *consequence* of his natural corruption, is *incapable* of *thinking* or *doing* any *good thing;* and that, therefore, it is *necessary* to his *conversion* and *salvation* that he be *regenerated* and *renewed* by the *operation* of the *Holy Ghost*, which is the *gift* of *God*, through Jesus Christ.

4. That the *Divine grace* or *energy* of the Holy Ghost, which *heals* the *disorders* of a *corrupt nature*, *begins*, *advances*, and *brings* to *perfection* every thing that can be called *good* in *man;* and that, consequently, *all good works*, without *exception*, are to be *attributed* to *God alone*, and to the *operation* of *His grace;* that, nevertheless, this grace does *not force* the man to act *against his inclination*, but *may* be *resisted* and *rendered ineffectual* by the *perverse will* of the *impenitent sinner*.

5. That they who are *united* to *Christ* by *faith* are thereby *furnished* with *abundant strength* and with *succours sufficient* to *enable* them to *triumph* over the *seductions* of *Satan* and the *allurements* of *sin* and *temptation;* but that the question "whether such may fall from their faith, and forfeit finally their state of grace," has not yet been resolved with sufficient perspicuity, and must, therefore, be yet more carefully examined by an attentive study of what the Holy Scriptures have declared in relation to this important point. Here Doctor Mosheim very justly remarks, that the Armenians, in process of time, positively affirmed that "the saints might fall from a state of grace."

Such, my young friend, are the two bridges which Mr. Spurgeon's luxuriant imagination exhibited at a glance in the Botanic Gardens. I am

almost certain that, up to this day, he never rightly measured the arches of either one or the other. Say, that he has not, it follows, that he was making a show of terms without understanding the subject to which they refer. Say that he has, then it is evident that, to serve a purpose, he wilfully and disdainfully caricatures the bridge of the Arminians. There have been some people in this naughty world who have despised the place and circumstances of their birth. It is hoped this is not the case with Mr. Spurgeon. It seems from his own statement, that God neither honoured a Calvinistic minister or a Calvinistic place of worship in his conversion. The simple plan of salvation was pointed out to him by an Arminian preacher, and in an Arminian place of worship, and also from an Arminian text of Scripture—"Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth." How, then, comes it to pass, that he is now so earnest in warning all who hear him against putting their foot in an Arminian place of worship? Has he found out the advice, "Look! look! look!" was false, and his experience a mere delusion? Was his conversion real, and did the Spirit of God apply the word from the lips of an Arminian? Then, how can any man sincerely and conscientiously advise another against what might lead to a similar result? As the elect must be saved, it cannot be very material who is the instrument, or what the place of worship, or even what the creed. No danger can arise in relation to what was decreed from eternity. If the Divine Being decreed, that an Arminian preacher and not a Calvinistic one should be instrumental in Mr. Spurgeon's conversion, why should he now decry the whole class to which such a one belongs? Has not God a right to use any means he pleases? "Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" And may we not add, "Who art thou that repliest against God?" In that hour in which Mr. Spurgeon left the Primitive Methodist Chapel, he had no notion of decrying Arminianism. It was an after-thought with him. It arose from his creed; not from his changed heart. When the Spirit of God, who foreknows and searches all things, applied the word and sent him home with a light heart, it would seem to have taught him by the preacher, the place, and especially the broad principle contained in the text, that his present denunciations arise from some other quarter than the Holy Spirit of God. It never could inspire him to say what he uttered in relation to the Arminian bridge. According to him, it only reaches half over, and shoves all into the stream that travel on it. Here Mr. Spurgeon and I come to a complete issue. I consider the bridge of Arminius is a solid, Scriptural, and real construction, and that his is a mere phantom. Like the Flying Dutchman, it exists only by reflection. There is "a high mystery" in predestination, because the heights and depths of human imagination cannot be fathomed. All the perfections of God, like the sides of a pyramid, are equal. Calvin and Spurgeon give him the head of a giant and the body of a dwarf. A wild imagination depicts the God of Love as all power and sovereignty, without the attributes of justice, mercy, and truth being taken into account. This gives one side to the pyramid, instead of four. From this spring absolute predestination and election, a partial atonement, denial of free-will, irresistible grace, and the final perseverance of the imaginary elect. All these are contrary to facts, reason, and revelation, and, hence, must be the evolutions of imagination. This will appear evident by entering into a brief examination of the five arches in Mr. Spurgeon's two bridges.—I remain yours, &c.,

DANIEL MACAFEE.

SECOND LETTER.

My Dear Young Friend,—We now proceed to the consideration of the arches. In doing so, let it be well observed that, if one of the five fall, the other four must topple down along with it. You will perceive, also, that the sketch of each bridge is roughly drawn by those fathers in the controversy; still, they were honest and consistent, and did not mince the matter. In modern times you will find some *wise architects*, who make out a beautiful sketch of a bridge of their own devising, and represent honest John Calvin as the author; it has only three arches of his, with two borrowed from Arminius. They have absolute election, *universal atonement*, *free-will*, irresistible grace, and final perseverance. This bridge is made up of two facts and three imaginations. The great and good Richard Baxter built a bridge of his own, in which he had the first arch consisting of absolute election, and the other four were taken from Arminius; in this he rejects the side-wall of reprobation. Calvin, however, would have laughed at such a conceit. He was perfectly right and consistent in stating, that, wherever election is held, reprobation must necessarily be acknowledged to be its counterpart. No man can find out a mean proportional between the two systems. All those who have tried failed in the attempt; one or other must be received or rejected just as it stands. Tens of thousands, nay, I trust, millions, have travelled on the solid bridge of Arminius, while they thought it was Calvin's all the way till they came to the end; they, there entered into a region where imagination dissolved into reality, and perhaps sitting down beside Calvin and Arminius, Wesley and Whitfield, Fletcher and Sir Richard Hill, they found out, "That the Lord is good to all; and His tender mercies are over all His works"—yea, that "He willeth all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth."

You will perceive from this, that I do not wish you to imbibe Mr. Spurgeon's spirit, or imitate his example. He sends all Arminians into the gulph of misery; but this is no reason you should send him and multitudes of pious Calvinists into the same unhappy place. Your bridge is too broad for that; you are not to condemn a man, who has real heartfelt religion, because he happens to have a gloomy imagination, that was raised and cultivated in youth by his parents and minister. It is no new opinion of mine, that, if Calvin's decrees were true and real, there could be no dispute about the matter. God, in His high and holy sovereignty, would have decreed one item that is evidently left out. He would have decreed that all men should believe it. Then, there could not be the slightest suspicion, that there is such a thing as free-will; all would think alike, and be as passive as hills and stones. That free-thought and free-will are in being, we have the fullest evidence. Bring an assemblage together, even of those whose creed requires a denial of the free principle, and, if free expression be any proof, they show as much free-will as any other party. I should think Mr. Spurgeon himself is endued with a lion's share of this sturdy principle. Perhaps, if he had

less, he would be more charitable to poor Arminians. He is very apt at illustrations founded on hearsay or personal observation. Anecdotes are like pedlar's mirrors; they show the face too broad or too long, but still, they are better than a pool of water. The image, whatever it is, is steady, being unruffled by the wind. Several of his were among my collection, and exhibited many a time before he was born. I must treat you and him to one or two; they always enliven a dull subject. One of the most acute and ready reasoners was the Rev. Robert Crozier, a Wesleyan Minister, who died the other year at the advanced age of between 90 and 100 years. Leslie had a short method with Deists, and this venerable man a still shorter with his Calvinistic brethren. One of them, in argument with him, asserted broadly, boldly, and honestly, that God had decreed everything, and *fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass.* "Well, well, my dear friend," said Mr. Crozier, "you and I need not fall out or get warm on the subject, for if God decreed *everything*, then he *decreed me* to be an *Arminian* and *you* to be a *Calvinist;* therefore, if *you* are *right I* am *right*, and if *you* are *wrong I* am *right*, so that *I am always right.*" Perhaps Mr. Spurgeon may tell you that mere ideas do not come under the influence of decrees—that they only relate to actions and results. If so, then thought is free, and I suppose words, also, as the expression of thought. What, then, about actions as the offspring of volition? Another anecdote is here quite in point. Rather a loquacious stranger was delivering an off-hand lecture on Predestination, in a railway carriage, a few years ago. He asserted, roundly, that God had decreed every action that comes to pass. A shrewd countryman was listening, but made no remark, although, happening to be an Arminian, he disliked that doctrine as unscriptural and absurd. The conversation soon dropped, as there appeared no opponent. The murder of a magistrate in a neighbouring county became the next topic, when the stranger launched out in no measured terms against the murderer. "Sir," said the countryman, "do you know if there be a reward for the murderer?" The other replied, "I believe there is." "Then I would recommend you to claim it," said the countryman. "Is it I?" said the other with astonishment, "I know nothing about it." "Yes, but you do," was the reply, "for you have told us that God decreed *everything*, and hence he decreed *that*, and you have nothing to do but call at the first magistrate's office you come to, and swear against your Maker, and get the reward." The force and point of this mode of applying a principle, and illustrating a dogma, came home with humorous effect, and, no doubt, taught the enlightened stranger to feel his way, before he launched out at large, among the simple people in the neighbourhood of Belfast. If I mistake not, Mr. Spurgeon committed a similar error in the Botanic Garden of that town. He addressed men there of more general literature, more theological knowledge, and, perhaps, of more refined taste, than he has as yet found around him, on any occasion, in Surrey Gardens. Many of them thought that the old story of "sanding the sugar," &c., was rather stale, and even ill-tasted. However, as Mr. Spurgeon cares about nobody, he will set their distaste down for what it is worth.

Now, my dear young friend, we are prepared to examine the several arches of Mr. Spurgeon's bridges. These, like the two over the Straits of Menai, are within view of each other. Fancy yourself stationed so as to command a view of the first arch of absolute decrees, and hence uncondi-

tional election and reprobation. Is this a true, real, solid, and Scriptural arch, worthy of the Divine architect? I apprehend not. It cannot be the construction of God, because it is

1. *Contrary to His nature.* The express declaration in 1 John, iv. 8—15 is that "GOD IS LOVE." This, then, is His very essence—pure, universal, eternal, and absolute love. Hence it is added, "In this was manifested the love of God toward *us*, because that God sent his only beloved Son into the world that *we* might live through him." Mr. Spurgeon might here tell you, this relates to the elect. Well! be it so. Our Lord himself extends it beyond them in John iii. 16, "For God so loved the *world* that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Here, the world is the *express object* of His love and pity. It relates to the intellectual world—to every soul of man. It means the same here as in Rom. v. 12, "By one man *sin* entered into the *world*, and *death by sin*." Sin and death extend to all, so does the love of God in the gift of His Son. The one is as extensive as the other. One side wall of the arch is now gone—absolute reprobation. If so, absolute election, according to Calvin, is gone with it, for the one is counterpart of the other. Be it observed that the term *world* never means the elect, but the whole or major part of mankind. In the following text put the word elect in place of the world, and see how it will read:—"If ye were of the *world*, the *world* would love his own, but because ye are *not* of the *world*, but I have *chosen* you *out* of the *world*, therefore the *world* hateth you." Try it now as I have stated—"If ye were of the *elect*, the *elect* would love his own; but because ye are *not* of the *elect*, but I have *chosen* you *out* of the *elect*, therefore the *elect* hateth you." See John xv., 19. This absolute election and reprobation are repugnant.

2. *To God's perfections.* Reflect on His *goodness.* "Thou art *good* and *doest good*." "O praise the Lord! for he is *good*, and His mercy endureth for ever," saith the Psalmist. He is the "Father of lights, from whom cometh *every good* and perfect gift," saith the Apostle James. Paul declares "The *goodness* of God leadeth thee to repentance." He is good in His nature, good in all His perfections, and good in all His ways. Goodness is a disposition to communicate happiness. God is happy himself, and hence, He hates misery next to sin, and communicates happiness to all creatures according to their nature, instincts, and capacities. Is it a proof of goodness either to reprobate a portion of immortal and intellectual beings, or leave them out of the number of the elect? I ask, with all reverence, was it within the compass of His nature, as the God of love and goodness, to build the first arch of Calvin's bridge, and by His decree doom the majority of men to perish? If so, there must be a principle of evil in God as well as goodness. *Mercy* removes misery; then how could it be exercised to remove what infinite "wrath and power" contrived? Glance at the *wisdom* of God. It plans for worthy ends, uses the simplest and best means to obtain them, exhibits variety in harmonious connexion, and shows a good design in all things. Where is the wisdom of choosing anything without regard to its qualities? Will a merchant choose goods, a tradesman his tools, or an astronomer his telescopes, without regarding their qualities? Did God make man so? and did He himself choose the elect from all eternity without any foresight of faith or works, or without any regard to

qualities of any kind? Is it wisdom in Him to glorify His power, justice, and wrath at the expense of His other attributes in the decree of reprobation? At what was He angry from all eternity?—a mass of material of His own creation? Where is the wisdom of all this? It seems to answer no end, and certainly no good end, to the non-elect. It is rather caprice than wisdom. This arch of Calvin's bridge was evidently planned in the dark, for, according to his own statement, God decreed, and then he foreknew; whereas, the first arch of Arminius was foreknown, being the production of wisdom, and thus designed to answer a fitting end. How shall we reconcile the absolute decree with the justice of God? It is impossible to do so. Justice is essential to His nature. It necessarily makes its claims on all intellectual beings. It demands and distributes whatsoever is right and fitting in the nature of things. Goodness gives the talents; justice demands their right use. It does not require the use of ten, where goodness has only given one. Is it just, then, in God to demand faith, where He has given none? to require works, where there is no principle given, or that possibly can be obtained to produce them? Is it agreeable to justice to send a man to perdition, because he is not found in the number of the one hundred forty and four thousand, when God did not enrol him there? Would it be just in the Divine Being to require a man to fly without wings, or one with a broken leg to run a race, and then slay him for disobedience? The case of the man who came into the feast without the wedding garment is here in point. As Mr. Spurgeon is fond of illustration, here is one furnished to his hand in Matt. xxii. 11. This man was not one of Calvin's elect. God's decree provided no robe for him. It furnished one for each of the elect, but none for him. Christ did not purchase one for him in the shedding of His blood. He was conceived in sin, born in iniquity, and covered over with the guilt of Adam's sin, imputed to him by that God, who did not choose to decree him a better robe. Mr. Spurgeon invites him to the feast; he persuades, entreats, reasons, urges, and makes the walls of Surrey Gardens echo with his voice, softened down into a mellow tone. The poor non-elect listens, thinks, resolves. He cannot borrow a garment; he cannot create one; he cannot find one in the whole creation of God, visible and invisible; and hence, he concludes, I will go as I am, since I can do no better. The only way he knows to go to the feast is over Calvin's bridge. Mr. Spurgeon has taught him this; but while he is setting his foot on the first arch, the invisible spring is touched, a chasm is made, and the poor reprobate is cast into "outer darkness, where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth," to the praise of the glorious justice of God, that condemns him for not doing an impossibility! So much for Mr. Spurgeon's imaginary justice and decrees. They blow out a man's candle from all eternity, and then punish him for being in the dark.

3. This *first arch* of Calvin's bridge *is not* in *accordance* with the *will* of God. Calmly examine this. Who can understand the will of God but by His Word? He cannot possibly have two wills—a secret and a revealed one. God has secret knowledge and revealed knowledge; but as he cannot have two understandings, so he cannot have two wills. A secret and a revealed will attributes to him two principles and destroys his unity. He is immutable. He cannot will one thing in eternity and another different from that in time. His will in the Old Testament Scriptures must be the same as in

the New. Whatsoever He wills in general relating to the whole can never be contradicted by any particular acts relating to a part. Here, then, is *His will* in reference to the whole human family, without exception. "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for *all men*, &c. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who, θελει *willeth* all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is *one God* and *one Mediator* between *God* and *men*, the man Christ Jesus; who *gave himself* a *ransom* for *all*, to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. ii. 1-6. Here, then, is the essentially good, infinitely free, and unchangeable will of God, that is only circumscribed by His own perfections. He knows that all men require salvation—that they are ignorant of God and the way of salvation—that they are sinful, guilty, and liable to perish, and hence He wills their salvation. If so, he must will to give every man a talent, and render all capable of receiving salvation; He must will the means to obtain it; and also will that every man should use the means, repent and believe. Three reasons are assigned for this by the Apostle. 1. There is *one God*—one divine nature, and one class of attributes inherent in the one God—*on* whom all are dependent; as Creator and Preserver, *to* whom all are responsible; as Lawgiver and Governor, and *by* whom all shall be judged. If God did not will the salvation of all, it would eclipse His goodness as Creator, obscure His equity as Governor, tarnish His justice as Judge, and destroy the unity of relationship that subsists between Him and all men, as one race brought into existence by His power. 2. *One Mediator* between the two parties, God and men, having the nature of both, that he may bring God down to men, and raise up men to God. If God does not will the salvation of all, then, Christ is not the Mediator of some, they have no blessing through Him, they did not require His aid, He did not take their nature, and consequently they are not "men." For He is the Mediator between God and men. 3. One *sacrifice*. Thus he became the *substitute* for *all;* presented a *divine*, *holy*, and *human offering* in behalf of all; *voluntarily* (John x. 18) made an *atonement* for *all*, and thereby rendered it possible for all men to be saved. If He did not, then the Trinity are not agreed—there is no unity between the Father and the Son; Christ did not assume the nature of all; the elect have one human nature, and the reprobate another; or else the elect sustained an injury by the fall that the others did not, and justice made a claim on the former that it did not on the latter, or else Christ would have satisfied for the one party as well as the other. On this point let us further observe. Justice is essential to God, its claims must be satisfied either in time or in eternity, either by a substitute or by personal punishment. Justice is also an essential unity. Try and conceive two kinds of justice—one kind in God, another in men. You cannot do it. This justice relates to one race of men, one obligation of all as God's creatures, and recipients of His goodness, and one injury as sustained by all; and hence, if justice be satisfied by the offering of Christ's sacrifice, it must either be satisfied for all or its unity must be impaired and divided. If Mr. Spurgeon says, it was satisfied for all, then Calvin's first arch is down, and his imagination has settled into a fact; if he says, it was not satisfied for any but the elect, then he denies its unity, and represents God as having one kind of justice for the elect and another for the reprobate! In Surrey Gardens, or the Botanic Gardens, let him try his logic on this, and free himself of a dilemma in which his imaginary doctrines have placed him.

4. If the *will* of God is against his imaginary arch, surely the *oath* of God cannot be in its favour. Let us try. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel!" Turn, now, at once, to a sentence of Calvin, the great, honest, and consistent author, or architect, of Mr. Spurgeon's long bridge, with the narrow turnpike and the "firm footing." Compare this with God's oath—"Imagine, again, how it came to pass, that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations, with their infant children, in *eternal death*, but because such was the *will of God*." Such is genuine, unsophisticated Calvinism, without gloss or varnish. "*As I live, saith the Lord God, this is false*—there is not one word of truth in it. Let no man in his senses receive it, who believes either my word or my oath; for '*I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked,*'

> 'Nor have I doomed the unborn soul to hell,
> Or damned him from his mother's womb;'

and, least any should say I have done so, let them know I would rather *the wicked should turn and live.*'" Such is the import of this oath, sworn by the eternal, immense, and immutable existence of God. He swears by the life of his love, goodness, mercy, justice, holiness, and truth, that Calvin's peculiar doctrines are false; that the first arch of Mr. Spurgeon's bridge has no existence; that it is all imagination; and that that of Arminius is firm as the pillars of Heaven. Now, if God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, he has declared himself "well pleased in his beloved Son," who "tasted death for every man." Hence, the declaration in 2nd Peter, iii., 9—"The Lord *is not willing any should perish*, but that *all should come to repentance.*" Here are His word and His oath. No other Scripture can contradict them. Calvinism does, and is therefore to be rejected as a creed. Mr. Spurgeon may try and revive it in England, and the Rev. Henry Grattan Guinness, the artistic divine of one or two and twenty Summers, in Ireland. These are the two giants in theology—the prize preachers of the nineteenth century! Surely both must have got their peculiar knowledge by inspiration! How shall we otherwise account for the boldness, and, in the judgment of some, insufferable effrontery of both? Take an instance of the Rev. Mr. Guinness. He was invited by the Wesleyan Ministers of Dublin to preach in Abbey Street pulpit. Six of them sat behind him. Here the boy resolved to teach the man; and, contrary to good taste and propriety, he availed himself of the opportunity to exhibit a skeleton sketch of Calvin's iron bridge; and exhorted them forsooth to "search their Bibles" and they were sure to find the black ore of which its bars and plates are made. Poor young man! He reminded me of a thoughtless hay-cutter on the banks of the Shannon. A fine salmon appeared at the water's edge. He made a dart at it with the pole of his scythe, and, forgetting the blade was behind his neck, he unwittingly cut off his own head! At all events, no man can do good by preaching any doctrine that contradicts God's oath and word; and hence those divines are wise, who judiciously preach the essential truths of the Gospel, and keep as far from the bridge as possible.

5. My young friend, you will find that this arch of the bridge in question is quite repugnant to the commands and promises, invitations and declarations of the whole system of revelation. A few samples may here suffice.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to *every creature.*" This command was first given to the Apostles, and is still binding on the ministers of the universal Church. What is this Gospel? Let Paul answer in 1 Cor., xv., 1, 4—"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures." Then, the minister of the Gospel is to say to every man—whether he dwells at Indus or the pole, whether his skin be white, black, or copper-coloured—Christ died for thee, was buried for thee, rose again for thee. This is the same as to say Calvin's bridge is imaginary—there is no absolute decree. Can any man be said to preach the Gospel as Paul did, who denies universal atonement? He meets with one of Calvin's reprobates, and tells him what is not true, Christ died for thee. Again, "This is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his son Jesus Christ." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." John the Baptist "came for a witness of that light, that all men through him might believe." Here, however, is a non-elect; he is not one of the *definite number;* Christ did not die for him. If he does not believe, Mr. Spurgeon sends him to perdition; and if he does believe the Gospel—believe what Paul taught, *Christ died* for *me*—then, according to the same authority, he believes a *lie.* This kind of preaching was quaintly described thus—"You can and you can't; you shall and you shan't; and you'll be damn'd if you do, and you'll be damn'd if you don't."

Another command may be here noticed—"Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved." The elect look; they cannot help looking; their eye is strengthened and enlivened by the influence of the Spirit; and hence, with eagle eye, they gaze on the Sun of Righteousness and are saved. The reprobate, or non-elect, look also; but their eyes are heavy, there is a mist in the atmosphere, the sun is not at the meridian, he is only to be seen through a long body of condensed air, the decree is between them and salvation; and, consequently, they are blinded, hardened, and ultimately lost, because the Spirit neither enlightened or helped them! They are in the valley of the shadow of death, where the air is dense, cold, and without vitality. Their eyes are closed, but Jesus does not open them. This makes the difference! The *promises* are equally as vain as the *commands* by this teaching. There are promises of pardon, influence of the Spirit, and everlasting life. "Turn ye at my reproof; Behold I will pour out my spirit unto you; I will make known my words unto you. Let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord and He will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. Incline your ear and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live." These are precious promises, indeed; but who can benefit by them? Only the elect. The non-elect cannot sufficiently turn, forsake his thoughts or ways, or incline his ear. The decree stands in his way; the Spirit does not work irresistibly, and God closed his ear before the science of acoustics was studied by our greatest philosophers. The same is the case with his *invitations*—"Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price; wherefore do you spend your money

for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here the invitation is to the unhappy—to all who seek rest in wrong objects. The elect come; the Spirit irresistibly and effectually draws them. The non-elect are left to nature; it is faint and languid. Wherefore do they spend their money and energies for that which cannot satisfy? The answer is ready. The decree is either directly against them, or it is not on their side. They are all cripples, but Christ does not strengthen their feet and ancle bones. He invites them to come out of the prison-house of nature, but never unbars the gates. He calls them out of the horrible pit and from the miry clay, but puts down no ladder. He entreats them to come to the other side of the river, but they are stopped by the turnpike on Calvin's bridge. Thus the God of love and truth is exhibited as insincere, by inviting them to do what he has rendered impossible by his own decree, purpose, or unwillingness. Attend now to a few of His *declarations*. "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life," saith our Lord. Again, "O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth chickens under her wings, and ye would not." St. Paul exclaims, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation." Why did they not come? The Spirit did not make them willing. If He had, some might have been added to the 144,000, and that would set the decree aside. "I would, but ye would not," saith Christ. Was he willing to break the decree, while they fulfilled it by not yielding?

In reference to the Apostle's utterance, how could the neglectors escape? The fatal decree binds them fast. They cannot break its iron chain. The Father neglected to put the reprobates among the elect; the Son neglected to die for them; and the Holy Spirit neglects to quicken and strengthen them; and hence, they cannot but neglect an unprovided and impossible salvation. "But this is spoken of believers." Be it so; the case is the same; they cannot neglect, and hence the warning is useless. Thus the number is definite. Not one can be added; not one taken away. All was settled before the foundation of the world. The day of judgment was then past. Mr. Spurgeon is one of the angels sent to gather the elect. He is a loadstone attracting steel filings from the midst of rubbish. He has a capital figure in his first sermon, with a little alteration. "Hark ye: the devil has many big nets, with which he goes a-fishing for eternal souls; but there is one big, black net, in which he catches more souls than in any of the others. It is stamped on the corner 'Procrastination,' and it is floated with many corks, every one of them marked with the word 'to-morrow,' 'to-morrow,' 'to-morrow.'"

> "Bad as he is, the Devil may be abused,
> Be falsely charged, and causelessly accused;
> When Heaven, unwilling to be blamed alone,
> Shift off those crimes on him that are its own."

Lift the first stamp, and under "Procrastination" you will find *Predestination;* lift the second, and under "to-morrow" you will perceive *absolute election;* under the third, *reprobation;* under the fourth, *partial atonement;* under another, *bound will;* under its neighbour, *irresistible grace;* and under the last, *final perseverance.* These corks have kept the net afloat since

the days of Calvin; and, if Mr. Spurgeon's dogmas be true, Satan is too wise to put himself to the trouble of fishing, when he finds all who are not in the 144,000 caught to his hand and ready for his fire. Surely Mr. Spurgeon must forget his creed in his earnest appeals to sinners. Can he persuade one of the non-elect by all his reasoning and illustrations? Will one of the elect be lost, in case he preached none at all? As he is an admirer of familiar anecdotes, perhaps he will forgive the following. I admire it on account of its good common sense: A negro, whose skin was as black as Satan's big net, went once to hear a popular minister preach in the United States. On his return, his master asked him how he liked the preaching: "Why, massa," was his reply, "me don't know. Ministe says God made bein' called man, and he gib one part of dese to Christ and all de rest to de debil. De ministe he go about seeking to get away some of de debil's, and he can't; and de debil he go about seekin to get away some of Christ's, and he can't. Me don't know, massa, which de greatest fool, de debil or de preacher." Now, I am far from saying that Mr. Spurgeon is a fool for his earnestness or illustrations. I do not believe in his peculiar principles. Earnestness is folly, if they be true. Whatever good he effects is not done by them, but by those that spring from a better fountain. Salvation by faith in Christ, the remission of sin, the witness of God's Holy Spirit, and holiness of heart and life belong to the pure Gospel, that was preached for ages before Austin of Hippo first broached these peculiarities.

I remain yours, &c.,

DANIEL MACAFEE.

THIRD LETTER.

My Dear Young Friend,—Having now disposed of the first arch in Calvin's iron bridge, and thereby shown that his decrees are unscriptural and absurd; that absolute election and reprobation, as the two side-plates, are mere non-entities, and, consequently, that the doctrine of conditional election and reprobation is the real and substantial arch of the Arminian bridge, we now pass on to say a few words about the second arch of partial atonement in the one, and universal atonement in the other. If God elected a certain number without any condition on their part, it would certainly be absurd, that he should give his Son to die for any but that number. If he did not, there should be an express revelation on the subject; but there is not one text in the whole book of God which says, he died only for a part of mankind, or that he did not die for the whole. True, it says he gave himself for the *Church*, and for the *sheep*, but, unfortunately for Calvinism, it does not say for them

only. Want of space forbids long prefaces and numerous inferences, and hence, we must come at once to the point, and prove the universality of the atonement by Christ's death. Take the following digest on this subject. That Christ's atoning sacrifice was intended for all is evident.

1. From *its extent* and *remedial influence* in *relation* to the *fall* of the *first man*. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." By his one act he lost the image of God, and all lost it; he embezzled the family property, and all are reduced to poverty; he made himself a leper, and all his offspring are necessarily leprous; he cast himself into a pit, and all, descending from him, are born in it; he raised a stream of polluted water which he could not stem, and hence it still bubbles up and overflows the world. By this *one act*, termed the *offence*, the *offence* of *one*, in Romans v., 12-21, he vitiated, altered, annulled, or destroyed the dispensation given to him: he forfeited the favour, life, and Spirit of God. Corruption must ensue for want of the *Spirit* of *holiness;* spiritual death for want of the *Spirit* of *life;* and temporal death for the want of the *tree* of *life*. All resulted as a punishment for that one offence. Without a remedy, all these must be perpetual and eternal; that remedy is found in the second Adam, Jesus Christ; he is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; the merit of his blood extends from the cross back to the first pair, and forward to the last pair that shall appear in the world. He appeared to introduce a superior dispensation, founded in sacrifice, remedial in its design, gracious in its gifts, suitable in its nature, and vastly superior to that of Adam in its possibility of success. All these particulars are clearly placed before us in the passage referred to above. In contrasting the dispensations of Adam and Christ, in their influence and extent, the Apostle makes two exceptions. The first is in the 15th verse, "But *not* as the offence, so also is the free gift; for if, through the offence of one, *many* be *dead* (does not this mean all?) *much more* the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, *hath abounded unto many*." Here, we are plainly told that there is more of grace in Jesus Christ to save, than there was in Adam's sin to destroy, and that this grace hath actually abounded to the same number that he injured. The second exception is in verse 16, "And *not* as it was by one that sinned so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification." As the 15th verse shows an *amplitude* of provision *above* the dispensation of Adam, so this also displays a *superior privilege* of trial *beyond* that enjoyed by Adam. *One* sin sunk him for ever; we rise out of *multitudes* that cannot be enumerated. This one sin must have been forgiven, or the first man could not have been spared a moment; justice must have punished him at once unless there was an atonement. Suppose it spared him without an atonement, then justice is not essential to God. On the principle he was spared a moment; why not an hour, a day, a week, a month, a year? and why not for ever? The atonement was made for him; his first sin was forgiven; all his posterity in his loins must have been forgiven that *one offence*. Christ, therefore, died for all by dying for the first offence: so saith the Apostle in verse 18, "Therefore, as by the *offence* of *one*, judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation, *even so* by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life." Here is no distinction between elect and reprobate. All are condemned by Adam's sin; all are acquitted from that

first condemnation by Christ's righteousness; and yet Calvinism imputes Adam's one act to the reprobates, and damns them to all eternity for the sin that God forgave both Adam and them, according to the statement of the Apostle. He that is able to receive this must have a wonderful control in keeping reason asleep, while imagination is at play. What is the final testimony of the Apostle in this chapter? "That as *sin hath reigned* unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Observe these two declarations: the one is in the indicative mood, asserting what is—sin hath reigned universally unto death; the other is in the potential mood, testifying not what *is*, but what *might be*. It follows, then, from this, that not one soul need have been lost; that the actual reign of grace might have been as extensive as the actual reign of sin; and, consequently, that Christ died for all, and that the second arch of the iron bridge is demolished. That He died for all, is equally manifest from those Scriptures.

2. *That relate to the World*—"The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein," Psalm xxv., 1. "All souls are mine," saith God; Ezek. xviii., 4. Let us see what He intends for His own. "God so loved the world," &c., John iii., 16. "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world, through Him, might be saved," Rev. i., 7. He was not sent to buy the existence of reprobates out of Adam's loins, and then leave them to perish. "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," John i., 29. It is not said the *sins*, but the *sin* of the world. So Isaiah says, "The Lord hath laid on Him the *iniquity* of us all." Both are in the singular, denoting the punishment due to iniquity or sin. He bore the result of sin or iniquity, lifted it up as a burden, that all might escape. He is called Christ, "The Saviour of the world," John iv., 14; "The bread of God is He that giveth life unto the world," John vi., 33; "My flesh which I give for the life of the world," Rev. v. 1; "I am the Light of the world," John viii., 12; "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," 2 Cor. v., 19; "We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world," 1 John iv., 14; "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *whole world*," 1 John ii., 2. How amiable, beautiful, and glorious are God and his Son represented in these passages! The one is not a tyrant, the other an executioner. Take the views of the *infallible* Synod of Dordt. God is a being of power and wrath—a capricious father, that loves one son and hates another, without why or wherefore. He did not love the world; did not send his Son to save all, and should not be called the Light and Saviour of the world. He did not give His flesh as the bread broken for the life of the world. He was not in Christ, reconciling the world, but only the elect, unto himself; and they testify that Christ was not the Saviour of all, nor the propitiation for the sins of any but the elect. John testifies that He is the propitiation not only for the Jews but the Gentiles, not only for the elect but for the *whole world;* but they choose to dissent, and prefer the testimony of Calvin to that of the beloved Apostle! Again, the universality of the atonement is proved, because

3. *It intervenes, comes between, or is substituted for every man.* So saith St. Paul: "We thus judge, that if one died *for* all, then were all dead," 2 Cor. v., 14. Here the universality of death, spiritual and temporal, is

inferred from the universal atonement. This shows that Calvin's bridge was not built in the times of the Apostles. The Arminian people of that day had never heard of it. Hear the Apostle again. "The man Christ Jesus gave himself a ransom *for* all," 1 Tim. ii., 6. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that He, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man," Heb. ii., 9. These declarations are universal—they cannot be evaded. The cup of death was put into every man's hand. All is emptied into that of the substitute, and thus He swallows up death in victory.

4. The universality of atonement is necessarily implied in those Scriptures that refer to apostates, and to those who do or who may perish. "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died?" Here it is positive that Christ died for the weak brother; and it is equally so that this same may perish, or be destroyed for ever. If Paul and the strong brother addressed, believed in an absolute number of elect, and a partial atonement, how comes he to preach Arminianism, and leave the impression, that one of the elect might be lost? Did he not in this case advance an impossible motive? Might he not as well have said, "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother" become a tree, a stone, or a mountain, or anything impossible in nature? As it regards apostates, let me place two facts before you. The first is from Paul—"Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who *hath trodden under foot* the Son of God, and *hath counted* the blood of the Covenant wherewith he *was sanctified* an unholy thing, and *hath done* despite to the Spirit of Grace?" The second is from Peter—"For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, *after* they *have known* it, to turn from the holy commandment *delivered* unto them. But it *has happened* unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is *turned* to his vomit *again*, and the sow that *was washed* to her wallowing in the *mire*." Now, these cases relate not to opinions or mere reports, but to facts well known to two inspired writers. Surely Christ died for the individuals here mentioned; and yet Paul tells "it is impossible" for those, who have thus fallen "to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

5. From the *universality* of the *atonement* we find the Scriptures full of facts, doctrines, and testimonies founded on the death of Christ. Briefly notice the following. There is *provision* for all—pardon, holiness, and Heaven. "And on this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make *unto all people a feast of marrow* and of *fat things*." Our Lord saith, "I have prepared my dinner; *my oxen* and *my fatlings* are *killed*, and *all things are ready*. But they *made light* of it, and went their ways." The elect are invited and *must* come; the non-elect *cannot*. Wherein consists the sincerity of the invitation? No wonder they made light of it; for they only did what they could. There are *benefits* conferred on all. Five facts stated by inspiration prove this. The first *fact*, not opinion: "Christ is the true light that *enlighteneth every man* that comes into the world." The second *fact*: "And when He (the Spirit of Truth) is come, He will *convince* the *world* of *sin*, of *righteousness*, and of *judgment*." The third *fact*: "For the grace of God, that bringeth salvation, hath *appeared unto all men*;" or, according to the

margin, "the grace that *bringeth salvation to all men* hath appeared." The fourth *fact:* "Behold, I bring you *good tidings* of great joy, which shall be *to all people.* For unto you is born this day, in the City of David, a *Saviour*, which is Christ the Lord." The fifth *fact:* "For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the *living God*, who is the *Saviour* of *all men*, specially of those that believe." Now, Calvinism either denies these facts, or resolves them into mere opinions. Again, God *commands* all to believe on his Son, and *condemns* all who do not. Does God ever command *any one* to *believe* a *lie?* Surely not. Will he ever condemn *any one* for *not* believing a *lie?* Certainly not. Then, he can neither command a non-elect to believe, nor condemn him for unbelief, because Christ did not die for him. The doctrine, therefore, that restricts the atonement to a part of mankind is not of God. Hence, the second arch of Mr. Spurgeon's bridge has dropped in the stream, where he sent the Arminians.

I remain, &c.,

DANIEL MACAFEE.

FOURTH LETTER.

My Dear Young Friend,—You must be aware of the difficulty to explain points so important, and press a vast mass of matter into a small compass. I must, therefore, be brief, and notice two of Mr. Spurgeon's arches together—free-will and irresistible grace. These two cannot coalesce in operation. If the will be free, grace cannot be irrisistible; and if grace be irrisistable, the will cannot be free. Mr. Spurgeon, therefore, must not admit free-will *in* or *on* his bridge, for if it cannot find a hole to slip through, it must climb over the side wall, and lessen the "definite number." Pass, now, from possibilities and come to reality. It is acknowledged by all that Adam was a free agent—that *his will* was *free.* Let us understand this. God made him in His own image, intelligent, free, and holy. The intellectual faculty could perceive God and his works, but it could not contemplate. Without will it could not dwell on the object, or retain it in thought. Like a fixed and immovable eye, it could turn to nothing and see nothing but what God placed before it. It could perceive premises, but draw no conclusions. Free-will was, therefore, essential to his happiness; and God united it to intelligence. He endued him with a principle, or faculty, that could choose or refuse, move the understanding, direct it to various objects, enable it to contemplate or refrain, and render him capable, as a moral being, of moral obligation, praise, or blame, virtue or vice, reward or punishment. God honoured the intellect by placing Himself and His works before it; he

equally honoured free-will by placing it upon trial, and thus distinguished our first parents from the minor animals in creation. This faculty, as well as the understanding, was the gift of His boundless goodness, the plan of His infinite wisdom, and the production of His absolute power. Hence, he pronounced it with the rest of his works to be *very good*. God could, therefore, furnish motives, promise or threaten, entreat or protest, require or command, but *never force*. This would be to do and undo, and raise Himself up against His own perfections. Man was tried, and fell. God foresaw this. Did this foreknowledge influence his fall? Certainly not; or else it acted against His goodness, wisdom, and power. Did Adam's perception of the sun, moon, and planets either cause or direct their motions? Do the calculations of an astronomer bring about the eclipse that he foretells? Neither does the foreknowledge of God influence any action, however contingent. All would be the same if unforeknown. Calvin says God decreed, and then foreknew. He simply represents Him as foretelling His own actions; and if the decree embraced the fall of Adam, then God is the author of sin. As God foresaw the fall of man, so He purposed to redeem him, gave His only begotten Son to "taste death for every man," sent down His Holy Spirit, made known His will in the Scriptures, and instituted the Christian ministry and means of grace for the recovery of the human family. Did God thus intend to counteract the effects of the fall, and place man again upon trial? Then, as Mr. Wesley expresses it—

> "A will to choose, a power to obey,
> Freely His grace restores,
> We all may find the living way,
> And call the Saviour ours."

If not, why does the Apostle tell us that our privilege of trial is better than that of Adam? One sin sunk him; we rise out of many. Why say that "where sin abounded, grace did *much more* abound?" The two prime faculties of the soul are understanding and will. The whole system of revelation is made to these two. There is knowledge for the one; motives for the other. If there be no free-will, why have we commands and promises, precepts and threatenings, exhortations and expostulations, invitations and obtestations? Why did the Saviour say to Jerusalem, "I would and ye would not?" The *laws* of all nations are founded on the principle of free agency. Every grammar of the babbling languages of the earth recognises the same principle—all have a *potential mood*, expressed or implied, signifying power, will, or obligation. Every man in existence is *conscious* of freedom, of power to choose or refuse, of weighing motives and suspending volition; and even of making indifferent things agreeable by the power of choice. What is the use of reasoning against facts? Calvinism sets up free-will to deny its own existence, and excites ridicule in the attempt. President Edwards wrote a large octavo volume with this intent. Its whole argument is levelled against a man's own consciousness. You read it, close it, think for a moment, and consciously say, "This book is false. It contradicts a first principle of my nature. I feel I am free." This is a short argument for a long book. In addition to this, if there be no free-will in man, there is nothing in him capable of receiving free grace, of believing or disbelieving, obeying or disobeying, and hence, of being the subject of praise or blame.

What, now, is the highest exercise of free-will? I answer, to submit to be saved by free grace, and use it in obeying God. But would not this be doing something? Most certainly it would; but it is doing what God has commanded, and leaving undone what he has forbidden." "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." Here believing is spoken of as work of the heart. On this ground, would not the believer claim some merit to free-will? Oh! yes, to be sure, he will have the merit of opening his eye to see the light, and his ear to hear the most delicious music! The poor prodigal will have the great merit of returning in rags to his father's house, and of eating of the fatted calf to satiate his hunger! There is great merit in a man using his feet to run from danger, or a patient opening his lips to receive a potion prescribed by the great Physician to save him from death! This talk about the merit of free-will, in submitting to be saved by free grace, is a mere cloud of words, raised to obscure a fact and support an imagination. Passing on from this digression, we return to the main point.

Every man must be capable of receiving or rejecting free grace, or else no man would be saved by faith or damned by unbelief. "It is of faith," saith the Apostle, "that it might be by grace." The one is suited to the other. It is evident from this, that grace is not physical power, else it could act as well without faith as with it. The physical power of God cannot be resisted; grace may. Is there physical power in perceptions, ideas, reasonings, knowledge, holy desires, advice, entreaty, invitations, and warnings? These are the cords of grace, not of physical power. These constitute the moral power of the Gospel and of the Spirit, and, hence, may be resisted. A few Scriptures will settle the point. "My spirit," saith God, "shall not always *strive* with man." Various terms are used to express this resistance. Thus we read of those who *despised* the "Lord" himself, his "judgments," his "statutes," his "word," his "law," his "goodness," and finally, his only-begotten son—"He is *despised* and *rejected* of men." And hence the Apostle calls out, "Behold, ye *despisers*, and wonder and perish." The same principle is exhibited as *rebellion*. Thus Moses tells us that Israel *rebelled* "against the *Lord*;" David says, "they *rebelled* against his *words*, and *contemned* the *counsel* of the *Most High*;" while Isaiah testifies, "they *rebelled* and *vexed* his *Holy Spirit*, therefore, he was turned to be their enemy." *Reject* and *refuse* are terms used in the Divine word to indicate the same principle. Thus, "ye have this day *rejected* your *God* who *saved you*," says Samuel. "They have *rejected* the *word* of the *Lord*," saith Jeremiah. The Pharisees "*rejected* the counsel of God against themselves." "He that *rejecteth me*," saith Christ, "*receiveth not my words*." God saith by Jeremiah, "they *refuse* to *know me*;" refused "instruction," saith Solomon. The Apostle gives the solemn warning, "see that ye *refuse* not *Him* that speaketh." Another word is used in the strongest sense by dying Stephen, full of the Holy Ghost. "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and in ears, as your fathers did so do ye, ye *always resist* the *Holy Ghost*." Here is the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit himself, showing that grace in varied forms may be *unyielded* to, *despised*, *rejected*, *rebelled against*, *refused*, and *resisted*. It is nothing strange, then, that the Apostle should command, "Quench not the Spirit, grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," and beseech his hearers to "receive not the *grace* of God *in vain*," which he

declares in relation to himself, "I do not *frustrate* the *grace* of *God*;" and that he "was not *disobedient* to the *heavenly vision*."

Four things are now demonstrated :—1. That *absolute election* is *false*, and *conditional election* is *true*. 2. That a *limited atonement* is *false* and *unscriptural*, and *that universal atonement* is *true*. 3. That *bound-will* is *no will*, and that *man* is a *free agent*. 4. That *grace* is *not physical power*, and, therefore, is not *irresistible*. Where, now, are the several arches of Mr. Spurgeon's imaginary bridge? Four are gone, and one only seems to remain —the final perseverance of the saints. I do not intend to dwell much on this, for a reason shortly to be noticed. I would just glance at his statement in reference to the children of God. He ridicules the Arminian notion of a man falling away; and illustrates his doctrine by the prodigal son, begging his father to do what he had done from all eternity, according to his doctrine; and, also, the case of a returned convict. Now, there are three ways of being a son or child of God. 1. By *creation*. Satan, Cain, Judas, and all the reprobates can never dissolve that relationship; for He was the Creator of all. 2. By the *absolute decree*. The elect were God's children from eternity; and, if that be true, not one of the definite number can dissolve that relationship. Hence, the elect may sin as they like; they can never fall finally. Their sins past, present, and to come, were all cancelled before they were committed! 3. *Believers are only* the *children* of *God* by *adoption* and *faith*. The first is a *natural* relation, the second an *arbitrary* one, and the third a *gracious* and *moral* one. *Satan, Cain, Judas, all* the *wicked*, and, of course, the *returned convict*, belongs to the first, *nobody* to the second, and *all* who *believe*, such as the *prodigal*, to the third.

The first relationship cannot be dissolved by hatred, malice, wickedness, murder, betrayal of friendship, rash judgment, evil speaking, low, mean and hellish passions; and, according to Mr. Spurgeon's "beautiful doctrine," to use his own derisive phrase, neither can the third. Thus he confounds moral and physical relation, the character of the elect and reprobate, and represents the God of holiness as entertaining no higher notions of moral bonds and obligations than a washerwoman whose son was transported! And this is called fine and great preaching! Let him compare the *high notions* of Lynch, a former Mayor of Galway, in relation to justice and moral obligation, with his *own*, illustrated by the story of the convict's mother. The son of that man committed murder; it was proved against him; and, being sentenced to death, the father was so well-beloved, that no executioner could be found, and he hung him with his own hands. In this case the natural relationship was not dissolved; the moral was. Is the blind impulse of Calvin's decree made without foresight of the moral qualities of faith, love, and the various graces of the Spirit to baffle and set these aside and save a man after he has lost them? It is evident to every one acquainted with the Divine Word, dispensations, and ways, that relation of a moral nature may be lost. Satan lost it, Adam lost it by his fall, and, in fact, all who die in unbelief lose it by rejecting purchased grace. Many instances are recorded in Scripture of believers losing it and not regaining it again. On this point, however, I will not at present dwell. This work is already done in a pamphlet published in 1838, entitled "The Final Perseverance of the Saints Anatomised." In the year 1820, when the writer was not much older than Mr. Spurgeon himself, appeared another, in letters addressed to

the late Dr. Paul—a man whose talents, acute reasoning, memory, and character, I respect. Both of these will shortly be re-issued. As Mr. Spurgeon does not seem to be well-skilled in the art of bridge-building, perhaps he may try his hand on anatomy. Should he return to Belfast, he may dress up the skeleton of Calvinian perseverance with all the imagery that metaphysics, logic, modern divinity, and even poetry can furnish; but when the decorations, flesh, muscles, tendons, veins, and arteries are removed, the bones and ribs will exhibit the same dark materials as the bars of the iron bridge.

I remain yours, &c.,

DANIEL MACAFEE.

Lisburn, Sept. 1, 1858.

PRINTED AT THE NEWS-LETTER OFFICE, BRIDGE STREET, BELFAST.

DIVINE PROVIDENCE,

CONSIDERED IN

ITS RELATION TO THE STATE OF THE COUNTRY,

AND THE

EFFICACY OF PRAYER,

WITH AN

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATION OF THE DOCTRINE

TO THE LAW OF

INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPEMENT.

BEING THREE DISCOURSES

DELIVERED IN

THE INDEPENDENT MEETING-HOUSE, BELFAST,

BY JAMES CRANBROOK,

INDEPENDENT MINISTER.

BELFAST:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. LEWIS,
16, DONEGALL-STREET.
1847.

PREFACE.

ALTHOUGH I publish the following Discourses, in compliance with the earnest request of many friends, I am by no means insensible to their great defects, both in argument and style. As, however, I have not time for revision, I venture to place them before the public as they are, in the hope that the importance of the subject will cause all minor topics to be forgotten or forgiven.

With regard to the doctrine advanced, all I ask is a candid inquiry. If it can be proved to be false, by all means let it be done. If not, then must we prepare ourselves manfully to meet the responsibilities which it involves.

The connexion between the first and second Discourses seems too obvious to require explanation. The third was suggested by the many applications I received, after the delivery of the first Discourse, to give a detailed exposition of the laws of nature and those violations of them by which we have been reduced to our present national condition. As, however, this would have required me to enter fully into the questions of agricultural science, political economy, &c., &c.—a course forbidden to the pulpit—I have endeavoured to simply illustrate the mode in which, generally, the subject should be investigated, by a popular illustration of "the Law of Individual Developement, as affected by our more prominent Civil and Religious Institutions." The only apology that can be offered for the laxity of style, with which it is treated, is the difficulty that would be found in getting a promiscuous audience to follow a more closely reasoned discourse.

Should a single mind, however humble, be awakened by the perusal of these pages to serious reflection, or a sincere Christian be led to a more rational interpretation of "the ways of God," I shall deem my labours fully recompensed.

J. CRANBROOK.

BELFAST, *November* 20, 1847.

THE

RELATION OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE

TO THE

PRESENT STATE AND PROSPECTS OF IRELAND,

AND THE

CONSEQUENT DUTIES OF THE CHRISTIAN PATRIOT.

The prophet Jeremiah, in the viii chap. and the 20th verse, makes an exclamation which seems strictly applicable to the present occasion. His country was threatened with the most imminent danger, the season for preparing against it had been neglected, the months of winter were drawing on when rescue from Egypt would become impossible; and being consequently left helplessly exposed to the power of their great enemy, Nebuchadnezzar, salvation was hopeless. Hence, in a burst of patriotic grief he utters the cry, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."

And do not these words express too our feelings, and the painful convictions which are forced upon our minds? With what intense anxieties during last spring and summer did all parties look forward to the then coming harvest! How much was felt to be dependent upon it! How sanguine were some in the anticipated consequences of abundance!—trade was to revive—the artizans to find full employment—the farmers to be satisfied, and the labourers all fed. In short, a glorious reaction was immediately to ensue, and the depression which we then suffered was instantaneously to disappear. But that season has passed. Heaven in its bounty has exceeded our hopes. Our garners have been filled to overflowing. Not the most dissatisfied has found room to complain. And yet, what are the results? The cry of destitution and of famine still arises from Munster and Connaught. The prophetic eye of the *seers* discerns in the coming months of winter scenes as fearful and as heart-rending in those provinces as any we passed through in the early part of the year. In some counties a reign of terror has already commenced—the more turbulent elements of society are breaking loose. Every paper contains fearful and disgraceful accounts of fresh blood shed, either for revenging real or supposed wrongs or the maintenance of real or supposed rights. Anxiety and solemn care take possession of every thoughtful mind. The difficulties of the nation are not over. Dangers still thicken around her. All her tears are not yet shed. And

when we look across the Channel, can we expect relief? What can England do, with her bankrupt merchants—her choked up manufactories—her unemployed workmen—her straitened currency—her immense liabilities—her exhausted benevolence? Had she the will to give all the help we need, has she the power? Had she the will and power, has she the wisdom—have any the wisdom—to know how to apply it? Alas! "the harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."

In the state of things which I have thus suggested rather than described, I feel it to be my serious duty to take up the subject which I have announced for this evening's consideration—"The relation of Divine Providence to the state and prospects of Ireland, and our consequent duties." I am sure there are great mistakes current in religious society upon the subject. I constantly hear utterance given to them. It is altogether misapprehended: and the result is, our own sense of responsibility is paralysed, a fearful neglect of duty ensues, God is charged foolishly, his government is carricatured, and intelligent men are driven to infidelity. I know some will say this topic does not belong to the pulpit; it cannot be treated without treading upon the hazardous ground of national and political economy, and the minister of Christ should be content to preach the simple Gospel. We shall see, as we proceed, to how little an extent these suppositions are true. But this we say, once for all, that with the childish, sickly spirit from which they emanate we have not the least sympathy. Religion, and so Christianity, enters deeply and intimately into all the relations of life sustained by man, and therefore that ministry is essentially defective which does not expound and develope those of its principles which constitute the basis of all national and political science. We shall consequently enter upon the discussion boldly. We shall seek proof, argument, illustration from every source whence it can be derived; and we call upon you, as Christian men, to listen, to judge, to receive the truth and act upon it, and to spurn all that you can *prove* to be false, however specious; and may God grant us the grace to receive wisdom and profit.

I. In the first place, it is necessary for us calmly and patiently to inquire into the doctrine of Divine Providence, and obtain as accurate an idea of it as circumstances will admit: then we shall be prepared to apply it to the case in hand.

Now, that the doctrine of Divine Providence expresses a great and an important truth, very few, if any here, will be disposed to deny. It enters into the permanent convictions of all men, in all ages, in every clime. It appears as one of those first truths in morals, wrought into our consciousness by the operations of a natural law of our minds, which needs no proof, which can admit of no denial, which simply rests upon its own authority. It is true there have been certain classes of men who have endeavoured to put God out of the universe, to deny him his supremacy and control over the movements and history of this lower world, to represent all as perfect and independent in itself. But they never could succeed, scarcely with themselves, much less with others. In spite of their subtle

sophistry the beliefs would wind themselves back into the human heart—"God is; and in him we live, and move, and have our being." We take, therefore, this for granted, that God is in the world, acting, felt, and to be recognised; in other words, there is a truth in Divine Providence; or, to speak more correctly still, Divine Providence is a truth. But it does not therefore follow that this doctrine has always been held intelligently and free from every admixture of error; and without entering into any historical examination, we might conclude from the known fate of other first truths in morals, that such is not the case. Take for instance the Being of God—what crude conceptions, what perverted fancies have men associated with this one simple idea! You need not travel back into the regions of bygone times, nor abroad into the territories of heathenism, nor over the boundary lines of Protestantism for proofs of this: it thrusts itself upon your attention in every direction. Now, if men have thus adulterated the first and fundamental truth of all morals and religion, how much more may we expect other truths, dependent on it, or associated with it, to have met with the like corruption! And accordingly when we come to inquire into the matter, we find this to have been precisely the case with the doctrine now before us. The various forms in which it has been held are sufficient to show there must have been many errors confounded and mixed up with it, inasmuch as these forms are often contradictory, and never can be all equally true. This being the case it becomes us to look into the question, and endeavour to separate the false from the true, the pure principle from that which man has associated with it, and thus to arrive at the rational and scriptural reply to our present inquiries.

In modern times the doctrine of Providence has assumed one or the other of these forms—First, it has been supposed that God is constantly and *directly* acting and working, at least upon the stage of this lower world: now suspending the effect of this cause, and now giving additional force to that: at one time bringing a blight upon the land by an act of simple volition; and at another, in the same way, giving fertility and abundance: *here* inflicting disease, decay, and death; *there* inspiring with health, vigour, and life: in one country causing change and revolution; in another, defeating the enemies of existing constitutions and confirming the powers that be: and all, by direct and supernatural agency upon the subjects immediately affected, or by agency upon causes removed but a very short distance back. Secondly, it has been supposed that God acts in none of these ways; but, having originally determined the end to be attained, in his infinite wisdom he recognised at one intuitive glance the means necessary for the attainment of it—the various forms of being, organic and inorganic, intelligent and unintelligent, which must become the instruments and agents for carrying out his plan—the numerous, diversified, and all comprehending general laws under the control and operation of which these beings were to be placed, and *through* which they were ultimately to attain to that condition in which this final end would be secured: and having thus in one thought elaborated the stupendous scheme, all that remained was to bring it into existence by the creation of these various forms

of being, and the establishment of these general laws. This he has done; and now his agency is concerned, not in mending his plan, in introducing new forces, new modes of action, or the compensation of imperfections, weaknesses, and oversights; but in sustaining and preserving the efficiency of principles and laws already existing. For distinction and explicitness the former of these views may be designated the doctrine of a *supernatural*, and the latter the doctrine of a *natural* Providence. The latter we deem to be most harmonious with truth, and, therefore, the one to which we hold.

But then, it is necessary farther to observe, that this doctrine of Natural Providence may be embraced also in a two-fold form. It may be so entertained as virtually to be a negation of God's presence and action; or it may be held in perfect conformity with these, or, rather, so as to demand them. And further, it may be so entertained as to impose upon intelligence and moral action a mechanical necessity; or, so as to be compatible with freedom and accountability. I need not say we hold it in the latter forms. Nor when we assert that God acts according to the doctrine of Natural Providence, do we mean the denial of *all* direct and immediate action—only, that *if* he do so act, it is always in accordance with general and established law—according to fixed and self-prescribed rules—never arbitrarily, and *without* the discoverable evidence of reason and cause. And in giving this explanation, we only express what is forced upon us by the present limitation of our faculties of comprehension. For the fact is, we know nothing whatsoever of efficient causes, nor whether there is any such a thing, save God only: all we know is the existence of law—i. e. that events take place according to a fixed order, the same antecedents being invariably followed by the same consequents. This, then, is what we mean by Natural Providence—that our Creator always acts according to fixed natural order; never in opposition to that order, nor independently of it.

With these explanations we are prepared to defend the truth, and to maintain it against the conflicting sentiment. We repudiate the doctrine of what we have called Supernatural Providence, as a figment and relic of the days of ignorance and darkness, as detrimental to the evidently designed development of man's strength and energies: we reject it because it fosters the heathenish and Jewish notion of perpetual miracle, accounting for every event scientific ignorance could not explain, by the superstitious conceit that a Divinity had been visiting earth—we reject it because it traduces the workmanship and skill of the Divine Architect, supposing he could not create a universe as perfectly as a man can construct a watch, by providing for all its uses and requirements in the original adjustment of its mechanism, but necessitating on *His* part what the watch constructor does not need, a continual interference with its springs and wheels in order to preserve its regular motion—we reject it because it turns us adrift upon the heaving ocean of time without rudder, chart, or compass; making us in effect as helpless as though we were the sport of chance; rendering useless provision, thought, and foresight—we reject it because it would act as an incubus upon our spirits; it would render unnecessary the use of the

powers God has given us; it would make us non-accountable for the events of time, because those events would be independent of us; and thus would it cause a reversion of our whole modes of thought and feeling.

Nor do we perceive any force in those arguments by which it is supported: they are for the most part as untenable in principle as they are inconclusive in inference. It is said, for example, that there are many events for which it is impossible to account by any natural cause, which baffle all the attempts of philosophers or experimentalists to explain, and which, therefore, must be referred to direct and immediate divine agency. But you will perceive this argument either takes for granted the thing to be proved, or else is founded upon a most absurd principle. For if it be meant by the many events for which it is impossible to account *by any natural cause* that they have *no* natural cause, then this is the point about which we contend, and requires something for its establishment more than assertion. But if it be merely meant that there is no *apparent and known natural cause*, then, the conclusion is based upon this principle, that what has no apparent or known natural cause is the result of divine agency, and must be referred to divine agency. From this it will follow that events may have at the same time a natural cause and no natural cause—may be *referred solely* to divine agency, and *at the same time* to divine agency acting *through or in natural agency*; for to one man there may be a perfect knowledge of the event, whilst to another there is utter ignorance; and in one age men may understand perfectly what in preceding ages they did not comprehend at all. And besides this, are we to suppose our *present* knowledge is the measure of the whole truth? Should not our very superiority in knowledge over our predecessors—men of minds at least as strong and as penetrating as ours—teach us humility—the humility of not placing more in our conclusions than is contained in our premises, and of resting content with the facts before us without throwing our conjectures *forwards* into the future eternity, or *upwards* into the infinity, as though they were proved verities? To illustrate what I mean by a fact which immediately concerns us—the potato blight—I have seen it stated in print, I have *heard* it stated more frequently still, "That since learned and skilful men—men of science as well as men of practical art—have applied their powers long and arduously to discover the cause of the blight, and have hitherto failed," THEREFORE we are bound to look upon it as the immediate work of the Almighty, and as a punishment sent for our sins. Now, what presumptuous ignorance there is in such a statement as this! Does it follow that because we cannot explain a thing now, that no future discoveries are to be made by which the sought-for explanation will be found? Are we not daily making fresh discoveries which unravel, as with the touch of a magician's wand, innumerable mysteries which had long puzzled our fathers and ourselves? How dare we then put our puny finger upon any event in nature, and say, "Here is that before which the genius of man must bow down, and whose complication it will never be permitted him to simplify?" Nay—even later: the false

breath of these impudent babblers has vanished entirely into thin air, the God of Nature's Interpreter and Minister, who, in the meanwhile, has been devoutly worshipping at his accustomed shrine, comes forth and tells us that he has found the remedy for the disease; and others, who test his words, declare he speaks the truth. And, the remedy found, we have but one step more to ascertain the cause, and thus deprive those of another fact, who, by it, would seek to build up this flimsy argument for a Supernatural Providence. And, as with this particular instance, so with all others, our ignorance can never form the foundation of a certain conclusion.

But a support is sought for the dogma from the pages of the Bible: driven from nature they seek a refuge in revelation. Of course, if God has said it, we bow down. His word is final. We, however, are more than suspicious that he gives the notion no countenance. We are sure that the Bible teaches just the contrary.—Let us attend to the evidence.

It is quite true that the language of the Bible is exceedingly strong in its statements respecting the agency of God in the world—so strong that almost every event in the material, mental, and spiritual departments of it are ascribed without hesitation or modification to him. Thus, for instance, it is said—"He giveth snow like wool: he scattereth the hoar-frost like ashes. He casteth forth the ice like morsels: who can stand before his cold? He sendeth his *word* and melteth them: he causeth his wind to blow, and the waters flow. * * Who covereth the heaven with clouds?—who prepareth rain for the earth?—who maketh grass to grow on the mountains?" Again, it is said—"The king's heart is in the hands of the Lord as the rivers of water; he turneth it whithersoever he will." "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he *moved* David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." We need not quote those passages in which spiritual affections are recognised as his work, nor those in which he is said to have hardened the heart, and to have blinded the eyes. They do not now concern us, nor have we to enter into their exposition. We only refer to them as illustrating and confirming the assertion that all classes of events, without hesitation or modification, are, in the Bible, imputed to divine agency. Upon this question, then, the believers in the Bible can have no dispute. But the question does arise, in *what way* are these passages to be understood? and so, *what is the* KIND of agency which God is here said to put forth, on account of which all these various events are ascribed to him? Those who hold with a Supernatural Providence say they express an immediate, *independent, unconditioned* exercise of power, similar to that, for instance, which bid worlds into being. We say they express no such thing; but can only be rationally interpreted upon our principles, which are right.

Now I freely admit that, to the man destitute of all knowledge of natural science, unreflecting and unreasoning, they would readily convey the notions involved in a Supernatural Providence. But is the advanced scholar of nature to yield his convictions to such men? Does the Bible begin to war with a man's understanding immediately

he begins his career of mental developement? Are thought, reflection, reasoning, inimical to it? Is it not rather addressed to these? Does it not require them for its full comprehension? Is it not the brightest gem in its evidence that it has a grasp of nature so broad, and withal so profound, that earth's most gigantic minds alone can fully sympathise with it, and which in all its extent is still as a point looming out in the distance, to which they have not yet attained? The question then is, not what are the impressions made upon untrained, uncultivated minds, but what sense does an enlightened interpretation give?

Now I say nothing about the glowing warmth and earnestness of the eastern style of expression; but I ask you to sit calmly down for a few moments and analyse the terms. And for the sake of simplicity and directness, let us begin with those passages I have quoted from the cxlvii Psalm, where it is said, "He covereth the heavens with a cloud, prepares the rain for the earth, giveth snow like wool, scattereth the hoar-frost like ashes, and casteth forth his ice like morsels." Now how is all this effected? Is it not by variations in the temperature of earth and atmosphere? by the evaporation and condensation of moisture, &c.? in other words, according to law, fixed and definite, which we are making rapid approaches fully to ascertain? Again "He causeth his sun to shine upon the evil and the good." How? By the revolution of the earth upon its axis, and its progression through the ecliptic. In other words, by laws which the mathematician can accurately state—laws through which he can prophecy the appearance of comets ages to come, and by which he has discovered, without quitting the solitude of his study (that mightiest, divinest triumph of human genius), the existence and precise position of a new planet in almost the utmost confines of our solar system. Again, from the 2 Samuel xxlv. 1, we quoted a passage in which it was said that the Lord in his anger to Israel "*moved* David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." How did he *move* him? No one I presume will say it was by a direct or unconditioned impulse upon his mind; for, to leave alone the theology of such a supposition, it is directly at variance with what is stated in the 1 Chron. xxi. 1— "And *Satan* stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." What is said to be done by the Lord in one place, is said to be done by Satan in the other. I shall be told, it means that the Lord *permitted* Satan "to provoke David," and although upon another occasion I might be disposed to inquire, whether honest interpretation required no stronger sense to be given to the positive assertion "the Lord *moved* David," yet now letting it pass, I observe—Satan could not provoke David excepting by means of representations made to his mind which elicited the determination asserted; and therefore, that is said to be done by the Lord which is effected, not by his immediate agency, but through means, agencies, and according to laws which he has established and appointed. Hence by the examination of these and other corresponding passages I deduce this general principle of interpretation—when anything is said to

be done by divine agency, we may, or rather we *must*, consider it to be done through natural means and in the operation of fixed laws, unless the nature of the subject or the scope of the context gives a different sense. And then, when we come to apply this principle to the language of Scripture upon our subject, we find it at once relieves the Providence of God of all those difficulties with which it seems otherwise encumbered, and thereby not only confirms and establishes itself, but refutes the notions of those who contend for a divine agency which acts in arbitrary variance with the decreed and determined ordinations of creative wisdom and skill.

The doctrine then of what I have called a Supernatural Providence, is not supported by either nature or revelation; the arguments of its friends are broken cobwebs; and since it is exposed to the many serious consequences we have previously charged against it, we at once and entirely renounce it, and fall back upon that faith, which, whilst it rejoices in a God present in the history of the world, recognizes him as acting only in the great, comprehensive, and fixed laws, whose efficiency he sustains, and from which he has never, unless it be in the ages of miracles, so far as we have reason to believe, varied or turned aside in the least degree. And this is what we expound as the doctrine of a Natural Providence. *

Having thus then cleared our way by an exposition of the doctrine of Providence, we come to give it an application to the state and prospects of the country, and are prepared to ascertain accurately the relation in which the one subsists to the other. We have seen that Providence consists not in an arbitrary action of divine agency independently of law, but in the appointment and sustentation of the efficiency of law through the operation of which the same circumstances are invariably followed by the same effects. Consequently when we speak of God's Providence in relation to the state of the nation, we can only mean that state or condition to which we have been brought by the operation of those causes which our Creator in his wisdom and goodness has decreed shall invariably be followed by the consequences of which we are now conscious. In other words we may state it thus: in carrying out his plan for the promotion of his own glory by securing the most perfect holiness and the largest amount of happiness to his creatures, God has ordained that certain actions, a certain course of conduct shall not fail in one single instance in producing to a nation wealth, prosperity, happiness; and that a contrary course of action; or conduct shall as certainly produce poverty, adversity, misery and that a mixed degree of prosperity and happiness shall depend upon the distance we recede from, and the nearness with which we approach to, the one or the other of

* "But all this is to be ascribed to the general course of nature." True. This is the very thing I am observing. It is to be ascribed to the general course of nature; i. e. not surely to the words or ideas *course of nature*, but to Him who appointed it, and put things into it; or to a course of operation, from its uniformity or constancy called natural, and which necessarily implies an operating agent. For when men find themselves necessitated to confess an author of nature, or that God is the natural governor of the world they must not deny this again, because his government is uniform: they must not deny that he does things at all because he does them constantly; because the effects of his acting are permanent whether his acting be so or not, though there is no reason to think it is not." Butler's Analogy, Part I., chap. ii.

these classes of action. Now there is no resisting the operation of these ordinances; they act quite independently of us; we might as well attempt to arrest a train in its course or a planet in its orbit as to mitigate, modify, or restrain them in the least degree. With the sublime and stern certainty of fate they move on, exalting to the enjoyment of the highest good, or crushing and crumbling to powder, in proportion as we obey or violate them. We need not stay to show the wisdom and the goodness discovered in this appointment, nor its fitnesss to promote ultimately the highest amount of good. They are almost self-evident. We now take them for granted. When then we say that God in his providence has brought Ireland to its present state, what we mean, if we speak rationally and scripturally, is this—He has made certain regulations or laws for determining our material, political, and religious condition; we have pursued a certain course of conduct, in regard to these regulations or laws, and are therefore involved in all the consequences. And since the state of Ireland is essentially bad—since poverty, adversity, and misery are ours, we know that we must have violated the material, political, and religious laws under which our Creator has placed us, and his providence is seen in making us suffer the effects of that violation. But, perhaps some one will ask, do you mean therefore to say that men's religious conduct affects their material condition, so that the profane, the profligate, the wicked shall as a consequence reap temporal evil?—the despisers of salvation shall suffer poverty and adversity?—and, in short, by testing their conduct by the requirements of the Bible, you may determine the amount of temporal good or evil which they possess? Of course we mean no such thing, only so far as our nature is one harmonious whole, and we cannot violate it in one of its aspects without affecting it in the other. The laws of God may, for the sake of considering them, be divided into several classes: each class will be then found to have its appropriate rewards and punishments. Thus the neglect or violation of religious laws entails religious punishments—the neglect or violation of the laws of mind punishes us in the darkness or perversion of our mental faculties—the neglect or violation of the laws affecting our material being brings disease, or adversity, or death—and the neglect of the laws regulating our social or political well-being, in like manner involves us in social or political evil. Yet this does not interfere with the fact, that a neglect or violation of our mental laws, *through* the darkness or perversion it brings upon our mental faculties, prevents the discernment and acting out of religious truth, and so involves us in religious consequences; and also prevents the discernment of the laws relating to our material or political well-being, and so involves us in material or political evils; and thus, in like manner, reciprocally, all the classes of law act upon each, and each upon all.

With these explanations, then, we say our present national state and prospects have arisen from a violation of the all-comprehending laws of our nature. Had we pursued a different course—had we understood ourselves and the world around us, the several relations

we mutually sustain, and which are mutually sustained by external things, animate and inanimate—and had we acted in conformity with those relations, then, without doubt, instead of poverty we should now have possessed riches, instead of misery we should now have enjoyed prosperity ; and to the providence of God is to be ascribed our condition only so far as we express by it the enacting and maintenance of general law.*

A great and a sweeping objection may probably be urged against this sentiment, from its apparent opposition to facts supposed to militate against it: e.g. it will be said a very large portion of our present difficulties and distress arises from the failure of the staple food of the masses of the people ; and this failure was such as no human prudence could have foreseen, and was altogether independent of human action. But to this objection there are two very obvious replies which destroy its whole weight—1st, we are not quite so certain that human prudence might not have foreseen the failure, had it been alive and directed to the subject; and we are not quite so sure that the failure was altogether independent of human action. We more than conjecture that in an improved state of agricultural science it might have been avoided, or, at least, remedied in time ; and therefore, we are not prepared to grant one most important item in the statement upon which the objection is based. And then, 2ndly, we most strongly demur to the assertion, that our present difficulties and distresses are mainly caused by the failure of the staple food of the people. They have indeed been *occasioned* by this; but between an occasion and a cause there is a wide difference. The clock strikes nine, and you leave your residence for your house of business. The striking of the clock is the occasion of your leaving, but the cause is the necessity of attending to your worldly affairs. And thus, whilst this failure of the potato crop gave occasion for the developement of the miseries of the people, the cause or the causes must be looked for in their general condition, and must be traced back in their operation for a much longer period. So far then as this objection is concerned, the views we have presented to you of the doctrine of a Natural Providence, and the relation it sustains to the state and prospects of Ireland, stand unimpeached.

In the second place, we pass on to consider our duties, which arise out of the relationship thus subsisting between Divine Providence and our state and prospects. Every relationship has its duties, and unless they are fulfilled it becomes to us a source of evil. Let us, therefore, seriously attend to these ; and the

First that we mention is, the duty of zealously and earnestly resisting the impeachment of the divine character for the evils under which we labour, and of endeavouring to place the responsibility upon the proper head. If we have this night stated the true doc-

* "In short, every man, in every thing he does, naturally acts upon the forethought and apprehension of avoiding evil or obtaining good ; and if the natural course of things be the appointment of God, and our natural faculties of knowledge and experience are given us by Him, then the good and bad consequences which follow our actions are *His appointment*, and our foresight of those consequences is a warning given us *by Him* how to act."—Analogy, Part I., chap. ii.

trine of providence—if we have placed the divine agency in its proper relation to our country and the world—if we have succeeded in showing the movements of God amongst us are in strict accordance with natural and fixed laws, and that the violation, upon our part, of these laws, always and inevitably leads to evil, and their observance to good—if thus, indeed, our condition and prospects have been truly created by ourselves, then, not in any degree, nor in any form, is the responsibility of these consequences to be thrown upon our Creator, but simply, strictly, and in every proper and intelligible sense, entirely upon ourselves.* We know full well that our natural indolence and self-complacency will resist this conclusion, and endeavour to stifle the principles from which it proceeds; for we like to be able to throw off the consequences of our follies, and negligence, and impiety, upon others, and to pacify our consciences by the falsehood of our helplessness. But that we cannot do; for though we may sleep and take our ease in the self-deluded consciousness of security, these laws of God sleep not, nor rest: they are ever on their appointed track—doing their work—weaving the thread of our destinies—making sure our ruin. And we know full well, too, that there will be another class of men who, with bitter hatred, will do their utmost to repudiate this conclusion of national or human responsibility—men who, having had the chief influence in forming national character and action—men (I care not whether they be priests, parsons, or statesmen) who, having had the charge and direction of the public mind, are to have mainly imputed to them the consequences of whatever course that mind may have taken. But their hatred and repudiation cannot injure the truth. It stands upon an impregnable rock of reason, entrenched behind the sanctions of revelation, and laughs to scorn their attempt. Let, then, the guilt be laid at the right door. It is not our Maker's—it is our own, so far as our individual actions and influence may extend; and when the wail of the famishing pierces the ear, and the lawlessness and bloody deeds of retaliation and anarchy excite our indignation, and the darkling scenes of the future arouse the worst forebodings of our hearts, let the conviction, that this is our own work and the work of our fathers, prostrate us humbly in the dust; whilst, at the same time, every feeling of manhood be stirred up within us, to assert, in the face of all gainsayers, the innocence and guilelessness of the Providence of God.

Secondly, summarily, and lastly, from this relation sustained by Divine Providence to our state and prospects, arises the duty of putting ourselves in harmony with the great laws of nature, and thus

* "Ought it to be entirely passed over, that tranquillity, satisfaction, and external advantages being the natural consequences of prudent management of ourselves and our affairs; and rashness, profligate negligence, and wilful folly, bringing after them many inconveniences and sufferings;—these afford instances of a right constitution of nature. . . . And thus that *God governs the world by general fixed laws;* that he has endued us with capacities of reflecting upon this constitution of things, and foreseeing the good and bad consequences of our behaviour, plainly implies some sort of moral government; since, from such a constitution of things, it cannot but follow, that *prudence and imprudence, which are of the nature of virtue and vice, must be, as they are, respectively rewarded and punished.*"—But. Analogy, Part I., chap. iii.

working out the salvation of the country. If it be true—as true we have proved it to be—that the Providence of God consists in establishing these laws, and in giving them an efficiency to the production of their own proper effects, according as they are obeyed or violated; then it becomes a solemn and imperative duty which we owe to it, to put ourselves in a state of obedience to them, and thus secure the great ends which, by their appointment, the Deity had in view. But, to the rightful discharge of this duty, two things are necessary —the full comprehension of the laws, and then their earnest fulfilment. Must there be a full comprehension of the laws themselves? Till they are understood they cannot be obeyed. And since these laws extend to all the various pursuits and employments and states of life, we must each one sit down calmly, seriously, and with a devout heart, to learn what, in our several departments, is the course marked out to be pursued. And just in proportion as we exert an influence upon society, are we responsible for the discovery of that course, and the good which through it can be secured.

But not only is it incumbent on us to learn all the truth appertaining to our particular calling, and which offers itself in our individual circumstances, but as we are members of society and of the body politic, and are accountable, each one, according to his capacity and power, for the well-being of that whole body, so must we diligently study, to the utmost extent of our means and opportunities, the great laws appointed by God, through which alone that well-being can be attained. It is not left to you as a matter of choice, whether you shall be informed or not upon the all-important laws of social, political, and national economy; but every principle of morality and religion, and especially that principle contained in the doctrine of a Natural Providence, which we have endeavoured this night to expound, enforces it upon you as a duty which you owe to man and God. Nor need I say, since religion enters the most intimately into the very texture of our constitution- since its relations lie at the base of all other relationships—since it gives sanctions and motives to the observance of all other duties—and since it, more than any other influence, gives tone and direction to the character of individuals and nations—especially is it a bounden obligation resting upon you to throw off the shackles of all prejudices, authorities, and creeds, and, with an earnest spirit, ask of your Maker, who will answer in letters of light, engraven upon the pages of nature and revelation, What is truth? Oh, sirs, buy it and sell it not: it is the germ of every worldly and eternal good.

But, having ascertained these universal conditions of well-being, we are not to contentedly sit down, as though all our task were done. To ascertain the truth is only the first step; then comes the more arduous and perilous duty of carrying it out. We must put ourselves and our associates in harmony with the laws under which we are placed—we must do what God shows must be done by the various calamities in which the non-doer is involved. This may not perhaps cost us very much in those matters which relate only to individual life; but we are called to more painful work than this: society

hugs to its bosom many falsehoods, and has placed itself in many false positions—we must strive to enlighten and convince, and so put put it right. The great ordinances of Heaven, in their bearing upon material, mental, religious, and political life, are daily and profanely sinned against; and all who think they have the truth, who know the consequences of the sin, who are God's servants and representatives, are bound by the terms of their commission to denounce the sin and warn the sinners. This cannot be done, however, without exciting their anger and resistance; and hence we are too much inclined to shrink from the duty and excuse ourselves by many plausible pretences. But this must not be—we must gird up our energies, and at every risk of reputation, friendship, and property, obey God's will, and persuade our fellowmen to do the same. Think how momentous the consequences! The prosperity and happiness of the thousands and millions who constitute this great nation are dependent upon it. And whilst one of those laws which affect our being is unknown and so disobeyed, we must continue to suffer the innumerable ills to which we now stand exposed, and cannot arrive at the ultimate good for which we were destined. And since the miseries endured by this unhappy land are the consequences of a violation of these established laws, should they not become to us daily excitements to the pursuit and the diffusion of truth—that truth which alone can prove our safety and our health? Let us, then, my brethren, with all the ardour of our souls, devote ourselves to this work. Let each one of us, in our respective circles, according to our attainments, become the apostles of God's universal laws. Let us fear no opposition—never be discouraged by any difficulties—never relax because of any reaction. The cause we advocate the Most High has himself undertaken. And in the evils he has attached to wrong-doing, and the good he has attached to right-doing, he pleads, in the strongest mode, the same principles. Men may be long in learning all the lessons—the struggle between truth and error, wisdom and folly, law and disorder, may be long protracted—may know many reverses and changes, but success is ultimately certain. It is ordained by Heaven and secured in the constitution of things. Yes, and even Ireland, the neglected, despised, and down-trodden, whose history is written with her tears—the child of deep emotions and a thousand wayward passions—with all her griefs, her follies, and her sins—she shall arise—the clear science of God's whole truth shall purify her heart and redress her wrongs—and, brought into harmony with God's great laws of social, political, and religious life, in her own native and gorgeous beauty, she shall exalt her head above the far-rolling, deep blue waves of the Atlantic—the Island of Saints, and the Crown of God.

But before that day there is much appointed toil, and sweat, and striving of spirit; and some of us may be gathered to our fathers, and have to leave the work behind us in hope. In the meanwhile, however, let us all be found at our posts, alive to our duties, and putting forth our utmost energies in reliance upon God alone. And

with this faith—the faith taught us in the relation God's Providence sustains to our state and prospects—never let the dastardly cry arise from our lips, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved." For whilst God is our help, his laws are sure, and we have power of will, no national good is too great to be attained—no national evil to great to be surmounted.* And may He, who is the shield of the mighty and the strength of the feeble, thus teach our own hands to work, and our fingers to fight, for His mercy's sake. Amen.

* "Now, in the present state, all which we enjoy, and a great part of what we suffer, *is put in our own power*. For pleasure and pain are the consequences of our actions; and we are endued by the Author of our nature with capacities of foreseeing these consequences. We find by experience He does not so much as preserve our lives exclusively of our own care and attention to provide ourselves with, and to make use of, that sustenance by which he has appointed our lives shall be preserved; and without which he has appointed they shall not be preserved at all. And, in general, we foresee that the external things, which are the objects of our various passions, can neither be obtained nor enjoyed without exerting ourselves in such and such manners; but by thus exerting ourselves, we obtain and enjoy those objects in which our natural good consists, or by these means God gives us the enjoyment of them. *I know not that we have any one kind or degree of enjoyment but by means of our own actions;* and by prudence and care we may, for the most part, pass our days in tolerable ease and quiet; or, on the contrary, we may, by rashness, ungoverned passion, wilfulness, or even by negligence, make ourselves as miserable as ever we please."—Butler's Analogy, Part I., chap. ii.

THE

EFFICACY OF PRAYER

CONSISTENT WITH THE DOCTRINE

OF A

NATURAL PROVIDENCE.

MATT. vii., 7, 8.

Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

PRAYER, or the attempt to communicate by a direct and overt act the states of our mind, our wishes and our wants, to the Divine Being, has always characterised men of devout minds and religious principles. The savage and the citizen, the heathen and the Christian, alike resort to it as a solace in distress, as a source of strength in their weaknesses, and at all times a means of satisfaction and peace. Nay, so strong is the impulse towards it that little exaggeration can be imputed to the beautiful and impressive language of Mrs. Barbauld, when she says, "If prayer were not enjoined for the perfection, it would be permitted to the weakness of our nature. We should be betrayed into it if we thought it sin; and pious ejaculations would escape our lips, though we were obliged to preface them with, God forgive me for praying!"

But it does not follow, because the practice is so general with minds of a certain order, that it is legitimate and rational. Many customs have been almost universal, which are both criminal and absurd; and many religious notions and usages once received without question, are now as unhesitatingly rejected. It is, therefore, properly a question left open to us—Is prayer one of those ancient forms growing out of perverted views of our Creator, and his relation to the world, still surviving in Christian times, notwithstanding our clearer light and better information? or is it indeed an act which our reason approves, and Christianity sanctions and enjoins?

Now, the language of Scripture in reply is positive and direct—"Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened—Praying always with all prayer and supplication in

the spirit—Continuing instant in prayer." And besides these express injunctions, we have the conduct of our Redeemer himself, who continually resorted "to a mountain apart by himself to pray:" and "he left us an ensample that we should follow his steps." This point, therefore, with the believer in the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament is decided. God, in his Word, has given his approval to the promptings of our own hearts: we are encouraged and commanded to "make known our requests unto God." And so positive is the language employed, that we are emphatically informed we are deprived of much good by the want of sufficient attention to the duty—"Ye have not, because ye ask not; ye ask and have not, because ye ask amiss."

But although the Scriptures give their unequivocal dictum upon this side of the question, the impression is very generally abroad, that reason leans to the other, and that thus there unhappily exists a difference between them. I say unhappily; for so, truly, must all such supposed differences be, since our primal guide and test of all truth, even the truth of revelation, is our reason; and, therefore, whilst the Scriptures are supposed to contradict it, their influence must necessarily be paralysed or suspended. Nor do we feel querulous with this necessity, but only stimulated to search with the greater ardour for the truth or the interpretation, by which they may be reduced to harmony; holding firm to our conviction, that what God presents to our reason through revelation will easily blend, at some point, with what he presents to it through nature. His works are one great whole. We propose, therefore, to devote this evening to the discussion of this question; and the more so as it is calculated to elucidate and confirm the views we presented before you, last Sabbath, of the doctrine of a Natural Providence, and may go far to remove the objections which may have arisen in the minds of some of you to that doctrine.

I think, by a little observation, we shall find there are two principal objections against the use and efficacy of prayer, into which most of the others may be resolved:—that it implicates changeableness in God, and a violation of the natural and fixed order of things;—objections, certainly, of a most grave and weighty character, and which it is absolutely necessary to meet. With regard to the first, however, I do not feel called upon now to enter with any minuteness; because the objection is old, and has been most satisfactorily answered by others before me. I shall, therefore, content myself with giving you one or two quotations, and then pass on. Dr. Price (see Dissertations, 2 Ed. p. 209, 210), in meeting this objection, says, "To argue this as implying changeableness in the Deity, would be extremely absurd: for the unchangeableness of God, when considered in relation to the exertion of his attributes in the government of the world, consists not in always acting in the same way, however cases and circumstances may alter; but in always doing what is right, and in adapting his treatment of intelligent creatures to the variation of their actions, characters, and dispositions. If prayer, then, makes an alteration in the case of the supplicant, as being the dis-

charge of an indispensable duty: what would, in truth, infer changeableness in God, would be, not his regarding and answering it, but his not doing this. Hence, it is manifest, the notice which he may be pleased to take of our prayers by granting us blessings in answer to them, is not to be considered as a yielding to importunity, but as an instance of rectitude in suiting his dealings with us to our conduct. Nor does it imply that he is backward to do us good, and, therefore, wants to be solicited to it; but, merely, that there are certain conditions, on the performance of which the effects of his goodness to us are suspended; that there is something to be done by us before we can be the proper objects of his favour, or before it can be fit and consistent with the measures of the Divine Government to grant us particular blessings."

Mr. Wollaston, in his Religion of Nature, very concisely observes, "The respect or relation which lies between God, considered as an unchangeable being and one that is humble, and supplicates and endeavours to qualify himself for mercy, cannot be the same with that which lies between the same unchangeable God, and one that is obstinate, and will not supplicate, or endeavour to qualify himself: that is, the same thing or being cannot respect opposite and contradictory characters in the same manner. It is not, in short, that by our supplication we can pretend to produce any alteration in the Deity, but by an alteration in ourselves we may alter the relation or respect lying between Him and us."—P. 115. We need not multiply arguments: we think these two passages contain a full and satisfactory reply to the first objection stated. There is nothing in the doctrine of prayer opposed to the unchangeableness of the Divine character; on the contrary, as other writers have shown, our faith in its efficacy rests on that unchangeableness. We, therefore, dismiss this topic, and proceed to consider the more modern and the more weighty objection, viz., that the doctrine of prayer implies a violation of the fixed and established order of nature.

It was inevitable that this objection should arise, as the influence and practice of the Baconian philosophy became generally diffused. The direct and increasingly developed tendency of that philosophy is, to excite and strengthen an irresistible conviction of the undeviating certainty of natural sequences—the permanency, regularity, and universal operation of fixed and established laws. Consequently, whatever doctrine is opposed to this certainty must necessarily excite the antagonism of that conviction; and this, most unfortunately, has been the case with the doctrine of prayer, as stated and enforced by most divines. When the disciple of the great Lord Veralam enters his laboratory or study, and prostrates himself with humble teachableness at the footstool of nature, he finds that all her instructions are but expositions and confirmations of this one text—the same circumstances will always be followed by the same events; or, to speak in the more magniloquent language of the common idiom, the same causes produce the same effects: the fact is illustrated in all his experiments, is necessary to all his calculations, and rivets every chain of his arguments: it becomes, therefore, with him, a uni-

versal axiom, an admitted principle, which he could no more doubt than his own existence. When, then, he goes forth into another field of inquiry, and is told, at the very outset, he must at once lay aside this axiom, and divest himself of this conviction, in order to receive a dogma in direct conflict with them, can we wonder that he immediately starts back with doubt, and henceforth treats the subject with contempt? Nor are we prepared, we frankly confess, to pass a sentence of utter condemnation upon the man's act. We are ourselves too strongly assured of the correctness of his *method*, and have too earnest a trustfulness in the wisdom and goodness of Creative power, when it endowed us with the faculty of reason, to doubt for, one moment, either that, by a diligent and patient use of the method and the reason we shall not fail in ascertaining all the truth within our reach; or that what they invariably conduct us to, cannot, in any sense, be false. The guilt, in our estimation, lies more at the door of those whose perversion of the doctrine has led to its rejection. Let us, then, endeavour to ascertain whether there is any discrepancy between the teaching of God by nature as to the steadfastness of his laws, and his teaching by the Bible as to the efficacy of prayer.

I. Allow me to call your attention to the remark, that, although the Bible asserts the fact of the efficacy of prayer, it nowhere asserts the *mode* in which the fact is realised; consequently, it is left for the research and inquiry of our own minds to discover, if discoverable at all. This is only just what might be anticipated, from the consideration of the circumstance that the Bible is not a system of doctrines so much as a repository of facts which enter minutely into the history of our race; and that, with regard to very few of those facts, is there given any explanation of their relations and modes of action. In other words, the sacred writers just state the law—"Pray, and an answer from God will be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened; for every one who asketh receiveth," &c. The way in which he receives—in what precise manner he finds—through what instrumentality it is opened: these things are not stated; and if ever he finds out, it can only be by a patient and diligent watching of the course of events, and the testimony of his experience. The Bible, therefore, cannot come into collision with our reason upon the mode in which prayer is rendered efficacious, for it says nothing at all upon the subject; it contents itself with the statement that prayer shall be answered. If there be collision, it can only take place upon this point—whether an answer in any way is given to prayer. Into this question we must presently enter; but, in the meanwhile, it is necessary to make one or two observations upon the *kind* of prayer to which the promise is generally attached.

We cannot, however, go through this topic at large, nor is it needful; for it is obvious and known to all, that prayer must be sincere, earnest, fervent, and persevering. There is one property, however, from which we shall derive considerable help by a few moments' attention: it is expressed by the Apostle in the words,

"But let him ask in *faith*, nothing doubting." It must then be the "prayer of faith." But what is meant by the term? It is clear it means, *prayer presented in the belief that the objects sought will be enjoyed*. But, in order to the existence of this faith, there must be evidence upon which it can rest, by which it is authorised. Without such evidence, it is superstition or fanaticism—it is not faith. This evidence must come from experience or Scripture: and as experience has never hitherto been much consulted excepting in a few cases not worth a thought, we must abide simply by the evidence of Scripture. Now, then, what is the evidence of Scripture as to the realization of the objects for which we pray? Does it state that every such object shall be realised—no matter for what we pray, it shall be done? You at once reply in the negative. You tell me temporal things are received only when truly good for us. We demand, then, furthermore, whether every temporal thing *we* esteem and judge to be good will be given? and again you reply in the negative, because we are short-sighted beings, and often put good for evil, and evil for good. God is the only competent judge. Consequently we come to this conclusion—we are only warranted to exercise faith in prayer for temporal things, so far as it is the will of God to bestow them upon us.* But since mental improvement and spiritual, godly affections and principles are always good, we have full and abundant scriptural evidence for faith in prayer in reference to these objects, and may, therefore, ask for them and expect their enjoyment without limitation. It is not, however, sufficient that the objects sought be good; another condition is required before there is legitimate ground for the faith, viz., that the means for securing the objects be employed in conjunction with the prayer. Are we warranted by the Bible to expect, if we content ourselves with simply asking, without making the least exertion in the use of the means, that God will put into our hands the good for which we crave? But if not, as I am sure you will all admit, then we have no evidence for faith in the efficacy of the prayer which is not accompanied by the use of the means. The prayer of faith can only be the prayer which anticipates the enjoyment of those things that God has promised to grant, whilst the means are used through which alone they can be obtained.

We are prepared now to return to the question, Whether there is any collision between Scripture and reason with regard to the efficacy of the prayer thus described? The Bible affirms that the prayer succeeds: does reason give the same affirmation? The Bible makes its affirmation without proviso or exception: it is clear and patent: its truth is cast upon the fact, "Ask, and it shall be given:" the only limitation is in the subject—the asking: it must be sincere, earnest, persevering, believing, asking: and then there is no limitation: the predicate—the promise is universal, unequivocal, it *shall*

* "It ought here to be further observed, that we are not to expect anything in answer to our prayers which is not agreeable to the will of God. Not thought we to wish anything which is not of this nature to be given us: for nothing else will prove a blessing. Whatever is right and proper to be done is a part of the Divine will."—Dwight's Sermons, 142.

be given—he that asketh does receive. But is it so? It cannot be a thing unknown. To say a man asks for an object, and does not know whether he receives it, appears ridiculous upon the face of it. Especially is it absurd, when men are asking for so many objects so very frequently. Do we find, then, by experience, that this prayer is actually efficacious? We have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that we do; that in no single instance is such prayer presented and found to fail; that the exceptions are apparent, and not real. Whenever we have met with such an apparent exception, we have found, in nine cases out of ten, that the prayer has embraced objects not ensured by faith's evidence, or has not been accompanied by the use of proper means. We say *proper* means, in order to give the sentiment emphasis; though, correctly speaking, no means can secure an end but the proper means; and, therefore, the phrase is redundant. It certainly must make a difference to a man praying for an abundant crop whether he spend his time in the tavern or plough his land. If so, then the principle is admitted that the right use must be made of the right means for securing an object, as well as that the object be within the circle the Scriptures warrant faith to enter. And if we can thus readily account for those apparent failures of the rule which come within the range of our consciousness, surely we are warranted in concluding, in reference to those few cases which lie beyond it, that the same resolution might be found. This granted, and it is proved to us that our experience harmonises with the dictum of the Bible upon the efficacy of prayer. In other words, it is a law of God's government—a fixed, universal fact—an invariable, undeviating sequence, that prayer is followed by the realization of the object prayed for.* And you will observe, that in thus putting the fact (which is the utmost limits to which the Scriptures go), there is nothing calculated in itself justly to prejudice the most rigid disciple of Bacon's school. No repulsive explanation is offered of it; all it requires of him to do, in the first instance, is to start off upon the inquiry, is the assertion true? This he is bound to by his own principles; and that before he dare venture an opinion upon the one side or the other.

II. We remark that this fact harmonises with the other known facts of nature, and so is perfectly consistent with the doctrine of a Natural Providence, as stated upon the last Sabbath evening. The truth of this proposition seems almost, after the explanations and statements into which we have just entered, to be conveyed in the very terms in which it is expressed. It does not, at present, state anything more than the invariable connexion between prayer and the existence of its object; and, therefore, should we fail in accounting for it, the fact takes its place amongst the many other unresolvable

* "In the immutable counsels of God it is established that there shall be an inseparable connexion between humble, faithful prayer and the blessings needed by the supplicant. Prayer is, therefore, as regular, nay, more regular a cause of blessings than ploughing and sowing, rain and sunshine, are of the harvest." Then, after quoting several passages of Scripture in proof, it is added—"From all these passages it is, I think, unanswerably evident that prayer is entirely efficacious to procure blessings from God."—Dwight's Sermons, 142.

facts which we meet with in almost every step of our progress in mental and physical science. Thus, e. g. take the fact, "that all bodies have a peculiar relation to electricity, so that when they are separated from their various combinations, they are attracted to the negative or positive pole of the galvanic battery; thus, the electro-negative sulphur is always attracted to the positive pole, and the electro-positive silver is always attracted to the negative pole." Or take this better known and more simple fact, "Electricity has a powerful effect upon the animal economy, producing instant death when in great intensity, as a flash of lightning, or acting as a gentle stimulus merely when applied in minute quantity." Now, neither of these facts can be accounted for at present; they stand out before us stubbornly unresolvable into more simple elements. But who, therefore, rejects them? Who, therefore, says they are inconsistent with the established harmony and undeviating order of nature? Nay, they are a part in that order, and instances of it. Now, just so it is with prayer, i.e. let it be constantly borne in mind, prayer, as we have defined and described it—it is one great fact we assert, in moral, or if you will, religious science, that this prayer is invariably followed by the object which it seeks—as invariably as the too intense discharge of electricity through the human frame is followed by death; and there is no more want of harmony with, or contradiction to the established and fixed laws of nature, if we cannot explain the fact in the one case, than there is in the other. So that should we fail in carrying you forward with us in our subsequent reasoning, still, as you cannot contradict the statements just made, the doctrine of Natural Providence, or God's action in the established order of things, and according to fixed laws, cannot in any degree be invalidated by the doctrine or fact of the efficacy of prayer. They are two independent principles or elements in our science, and are established, not by their mutual relationship, but by their individual evidence; and till that evidence is destroyed, no want of explanation can put them without the comprehension of our belief.

But we are disposed to go somewhat farther than this: we think an approach may be made to the sought-for explanation; and in that explanation we shall find nothing contradictory to our doctrine of Natural Providence. Two modes of explanation have been resorted to—viz., the supposition of a direct and an immediate agency of God; and of a reflex and beneficial influence upon the mind of the supplicant.

Now, you will observe, there is nothing in the doctrine of Natural Providence, as held by us, to conflict with the first of these suppositions; for, you remember, in stating that doctrine last Sabbath, we expressly used these words—"Nor do we mean the denial of *all* direct and immediate action; only, that if he *do* so act, it is always in accordance with general and established laws, according to fixed and self-prescribed rules; never arbitrarily, and without the discoverable evidence of reason and cause. And when we give this explanation, we are only expressing what is forced upon us by the limitation of our faculties of comprehension. For the fact is, we know

nothing whatsoever of efficient causes, nor whether there is any such a thing, save God only. All we know is, the existence of law; i. e. that events take place according to a fixed order, the same antecedents being invariably followed by the same consequents. This, then, is what we mean by Natural Providence: that our Creator always acts according to fixed natural order, never in opposition to that order, nor independently of it." From this quotation, you perceive, it is perfectly admissable, in consistency with our doctrine, that the answer to prayer should be effected by the direct agency of God, in the production of the event or object which the prayer embraces. But then, the admission would amount to no more than this—that the fact of prayer is invariably followed by the fact of the existent, sought-for object; i. e. without the intervention of other facts between the antecedent—prayer, and the consequent—its existent object. Just the same as if you drop a spark upon the composition we call gunpowder, it will invariably be followed by what we call an explosion. But then, though there is nothing intervening between the dropping of the spark and the explosion, we know nothing of the efficient cause—the spark is not that cause—it is only the invariable antecedent; and we have as much right to say there is Divine agency in this case, and that the Divine agency is the only cause of the explosion, as we have to say Divine agency is the cause of the answer of prayer. The dropping of the spark and the prayer are both antecedents—the explosion and the existence of the sought-for object of prayer are both the never-failing consequents—the two cases sustain similar relations, and require similar expositions. But if the analogy should be objected to, because of the supposed resemblance between the spark and the explosion in the one case, and the utter want of resemblance between the prayer and the existent object in the other to avoid the quibble, but only for that, I give it up, and point you to another case in which no such resemblance exists—that, for instance, of the point of a sword and the painful sensation it causes when run into the flesh. Now, here (as Dr. Reid observes) there is no resemblance whatsoever—the point of a sword and the sensation (pain) are more distinct from each other than midnight and noon—than good and evil—than any two objects whatsoever—they have no single point of agreement; yet the one invariably produces the other—i. e. invariably is followed by the other. Of its efficient cause, however—i. e. *why* the point of the sword produces the pain—we are utterly ignorant, and may, if we think it right, impute it to direct Divine agency—just the same as upon the supposition now before us, the answer of prayer is imputed to the same direct cause. But the imputation in neither case can interfere with the established and fixed laws of nature, which, notwithstanding, move on precisely in the same order, and with the same unerring constancy. Granting, then, the truth of the hypothesis, that Divine agency, directly exerted, is the cause of the answer to prayer, yet it would not disturb our proved doctrine of Natural Providence; but the prayer and its existent object would still only come in amongst other general laws of nature, and require to be taken into the account in tracing out the cause of our present condition.

But you must have perceived, although we have argued upon the supposition that no fact intervenes between the prayer and its existent object, in order to show, even upon that ground, its consistency with our doctrine; yet, in truth, we have already included within our data something more, inasmuch as, in our inquiries under the first head of the discourse, we found we must consider the right use of the right means an essential pre-requisite to the existence of faith in prayer—in other words, we have no authority to believe our prayers will be efficacious, unless we use right means to obtain what we pray for.* Now, if that be the case, and we would scarcely consider it worth while to argue with those who deny it; then must we not conclude those means have something to do with the attainment of the object? and are they not facts intervening between the prayer and its answer, and therefore essential points in the statement of the general law? But, perhaps, it will be said—yes, they have something to do with the attainment of the object, but it is only as means. True; but then nothing else is to be regarded in any other light. The taking of food into the stomach is only a means; its assimilation to the chyle, and of the chyle to the blood, are only means; the diffusion of the blood through the system, and its formation into the ultimate tissues, are only means; the efficient cause of the whole process is, God acting directly, or God acting indirectly. But with this we have nothing now to do: all we are concerned about is, what you call the right means, and what I call, according to general idiom, secondary causes, or in other words, that course of action ordained by God in the order of nature, necessary for the making sure of any particular object. Now, in granting me the necessity of these means, you have granted me all I ask; because, since they thus are concerned in the attainment of the object of prayer, it must be, through, or in them, that the efficiency of God acts; and this is the doctrine of a Natural Providence, for which I was contending on the past Sabbath evening, and which gave rise to our inquiries to-night. But if it be through and in the use of the means—i. e. putting into operation those agencies, or bringing into action those laws which have a natural adaptation or fitness to produce the existence of the objects at which we aim, that our prayers receive an answer, then does it not, of necessity, suggest itself to our minds, that the answer may be more correctly said to be secured by the means used than by the prayer itself? Or, to express it more accurately still—the prayer is the first link in that succession of events which terminates in the object for which we pray. And if it be so, then we can easily account for what otherwise is quite inexplicable, the frequent failure of our

* "We must not only ask, but seek: we must second our prayers with our endeavours; we must, in the *use of the appointed means*, seek for that which we ask for, else we *tempt* God. When the dresser of the vineyard asked for a year's respite for the barren fig-tree, he added, I *will dig about it*. God gives knowledge and grace to those that search the Scriptures, and wait at wisdom's gates; and power against sin to those that avoid the occasions of it. . . . We must seek diligently, we must continue knocking, must persevere in prayer, and in the *use of means*; must endure *to the end in duty*."—Matt. Henry, *in loc.*

prayers in securing the end—viz., by the want of the use of the right means, or of perseverance in that use.

This leads me, however, to notice the second supposition, in accounting for the efficacy of prayer, viz., its reflex and beneficial influence upon the mind of the supplicant: by which is meant those holy states of mind and feeling—that love of purity and God, and that hatred to evil—that firm determination to do the right and to shun the wrong—together with the quickening and exalting influence, intellectual and moral, under which we come of necessity, by drawing nigh unto God in prayer. Dr. Dwight has stated this reflex influence very clearly, when, in answer to the objection, that it is useless to declare our wants to an Omniscient being, he says—"The true end of reciting our wants before God is, doubtless, far different from what the objection supposes. Unquestionably it is the same end with that which we propose in confessing our sins, viz., *the production of proper views in our own minds.* It is to awaken in ourselves a strong sense of our feebleness, our guilt, our dependence on God for all good, and our indebtedness to him for every gift we receive. By such views deeply impressed, we are more happily prepared for the reception of blessing than we otherwise can be. We are rendered humble, submissive, affected with the greatness of our necessities, the importance of those supplies which we ask, and the glory of that goodness by which such beings are supplied. This state of mind is the happiest of all dispositions for the reception of mercies, and *is invrought effectually in us only by prayer.* Dr. Paley says, "*Prayer has a natural tendency to amend the petitioner himself;* and thus to bring him within the rules which the wisdom of the Deity has prescribed to the dispensation of his favours." And Dr. Price observes on intercessory prayer—"No one can help feeling how happy an effect this must have in sweetening our tempers, in reconciling us to all about us, and causing every unfriendly passion to die away within us. We cannot offer up prayers to God for our fellowmen without setting them before our minds in some of the most engaging lights possible; as partaking of the same nature with ourselves, liable to the same wants and sufferings, and in the same helpless circumstances; as children of the same Father, subjects of the same all-wise government, and heirs of the same hopes. He who prays for others with understanding and sincerity, must see himself on the same level with them; he must be ready to do them all the good in his power, he must be pleased with whatever happiness they enjoy, he can do nothing to lessen their credit or comfort; and fervent desires will naturally rise within him while thus engaged, that his own breast may be the seat of all those good dispositions and virtues which he prays that they may be blessed with. . . . How excellent a parent or friend is he likely to make who always remembers before God the concerns and interests of his children and friends, in the same manner that he remembers his own. Is there a more rational way of expressing benevolence than this, or a more effectual way of promoting and enlarging it? Nothing is more desirable or

more delightful than to feel ourselves continually under the power of kind affections to all about us. Would we be thus happy—would we have our hearts in a constant state of love and good-will—would we have every tender sentiment strong and active in our breasts? Let us be constant and diligent in this part of devotion, and pray continually for others as we do for ourselves." Other quotations might be added, from different authors, but these suffice, and especially as your own consciousness must teach you the benefit you immediately derive from this exercise. Since, then, there is this reflex and beneficial influence upon the mind of the supplicant, it is not difficult to see how the very engagement in prayer becomes the means of securing the end prayed for. If that end be internal, a subjective state of mind, then the prayer directly produces it, by drawing out before the mind's eye those objects which call it forth; if it be external and objective, then it is effected much after the same mode: thus, for instance, if a man pray to be delivered from some particular temptation, will not the very act of prayer, by which he calls before him the greatness of God's majesty and his infinite hatred of sin—the greatness of the offence to which he is tempted—the fearful consequences and the base ingratitude—become thus the necessary excitement of those holy affections, which will so strengthen the will to duty as to render it a moral impossibility that he should, under such circumstances, yield to evil? And if the object be some temporal good, will not the act of prayer, in like manner, be calculated to call forth that deep seriousness, that calm and steady contemplation, and that enlargedness of thought, and, withal, that fixedness of purpose, which are more than half way to its attainment? It may, perhaps, be suggested, that regarding prayer in this aspect, meditation and serious reflection would be equally efficacious; but no one who has made the experiment will say so. The two results are quite incomparable. There is a lofty elevation, a transcendent comprehensiveness, and a sublime energy imparted to the mind by Divine communion, which it surpasses the power of any other agency to produce. It thus becomes the impulse and the strength of a course of action, before which Alpine heights become as molehills, and boundless oceans as shallow fords; which laughs at dangers and foes, and moves on with the persevering certainty of time, till it has attained its end.

We do not insist upon this one simple view—you may combine it with the others: all we do is to commend it to your most serious, patient, and prayerful attention. But whether you adopt this explanation of the efficacy of prayer alone—or whether you add to it a direct and immediate agency upon the part of the Divine and All-sufficient Cause of all things, in producing the object sought—or whether you deny all other efficacy than that which exists in His immediate action—or whether you say there is no explanation at present to be given at all, but we must be content with the naked fact; whichever of these views you take, we think we have satisfactorily shown that they each and all perfectly harmonise with, and are perfectly consistent with the expositions we have given of the

doctrine of a Natural Providence, or the fact that God's agency in the world is carried on by those natural laws, and by those fixed and self-prescribed rules which he established in the dawn of creation: never arbitrarily and without the discoverable evidence of reason and cause. Indeed the beautiful blending of this doctrine of prayer with that doctrine of Providence, we take to be one of its richest proofs—it is so like our Maker's consistency in rendering one or two simple principles the foundation of the most diversified operations, and the vinculum at once of the strength, the order, the beauty, and the harmony which pervade not only the insignificant system in which our own earthly home finds a place, but those more magnificent stellar continents which baffle and confuse our feeble understanding in its effort to count their number, and to measure their distance or their magnitude, and which constitute the great universal whole through the entirety of which we discern his ineffable glory.

Feeling ourselves thus invested with a responsibility which we had not before contemplated—a responsibility which affects us in our individual, social, and national capacities—which enters deeply and intimately into all the relations of life—which makes the future our own creation, and our destinies our own production—which puts into our hands the alternative of life or death, of individual and national greatness and happiness, or of individual and national undoing—and, overwhelmed sometimes by the thought of our weakness, our frailties, and proneness to sin, with what enraptured and hallowed joy should we hail the announcement of our text, that amongst the fixed and eternal laws of his dominions this is one, prayer, earnest, fervent, persevering, believing, shall not fail; but every one who asketh shall receive; he that seeketh shall find; to him that knocketh it shall be opened! With this assurance we will gird ourselves to the mighty work which lies before us—our own developement and our country's regeneration, nor will we tire or faint.

Nay, this law—this efficacy of prayer—this omnipotence over the future, becomes itself a responsibility—how sublime! How awful! How divine! May God vouchsafe the grace to make it a blessing! Amen.

INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPEMENT,

REQUIRED BY DIVINE LAW—REFUSED BY EXISTING INSTITUTIONS.

I FEEL it needful, once more, before entering upon the subject of this evening's discussion, to explain the grounds on which I justify myself for doing so. There are many people of most excellent intentions and of most ardent religious feelings, and for whom, therefore, I entertain the greatest respect, who will be disposed at once, and without mitigation, to pass upon me, for the course I am pursuing, a sentence of utter condemnation. Their notions of the duties and range of subjects allotted to the Christian minister are wholly scandalized by the unusual topics which I am introducing within the sacred precincts of the pulpit. I feel sorry for this; but it is on their account, not my own. I am persuaded it arises from the want of consideration, and has only to be reflected on to be corrected—at least in judgment, although not perhaps in feeling; for our feelings often revolt for a long time at that which our judgments have ceased to condemn. Should there be any such persons here to-night, then, will they allow me to ask them whether it is the duty of the Christian minister to expound all the doctrines, precepts, and principles he finds in the Bible? I am sure they will admit that it is. But if so, will they tell me how it can be done without going to a much greater extent even than I have gone, or purpose going, into the great and agitating questions of the day? For example, how could those holy words of Christ be enforced, "render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's," without discussing the great questions of Civil and Religious Liberty? And how could such a passage be enforced as that in the 13th chapter of Romans—"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers which be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God," &c., without entering into the question of the foundations of society, political relationships, and the mutual rights and duties of rulers and subjects? It is true we might spend a deal of empty declamation upon the text without touching upon these topics; but would that be the way to discharge the responsibilities of the ministerial office? Would you be satisfied with such a style of teaching? I think better of the Christian men and women of Belfast than to imagine it for one moment. I am justified, therefore, in the introduction of such subjects.

But, besides, this I have the illustrious example of the noblest men that ever breathed—the Reformers throughout Europe, the Covenanters of Scotland, and the Puritans of England. Did they not "preach to the times?" Did they not denounce, in the strongest terms, the social and political evils of the day? Did they not roll the thunders of their eloquence, without fear or pity, against the tyrants of their country, until their power tottered beneath them? And was it not by their thus identifying themselves with the masses of the people that much of their success was obtained? And shall we, their children, count ourselves too pure to be clothed with their fallen mantle? Must we mince out nice words, endlessly repeating our lullaby song, and behaving with starched and all due formal decorum, in order to tickle the ears of those who count themselves so very respectable, and to please the vitiated palate of those who claim for themselves exclusively the denomination of saints, whilst God's heritage is polluted, and his own children are wronged, are oppressed, are denied the rights their Father gave them, and are starved off by wholesale? God forgive us our tameness in times past, by which we may have countenanced the presentation of "robbery for a burnt-offering," and grant us grace henceforth to tread more closely in the footsteps of those "of whom the world was not worthy, and who, by their faith and patience, now inherit the promises!"

Having said thus much in self-justification, let us proceed to the topic which lies before us to-night; and, as the basis of our observations, and as involving the great principle we have to expound, we direct your attention to Proverbs iv., 18: "But the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

The principle of developement may be observed in operation, at least to an extent, throughout God's works. And not only is it impressed upon the present order of things, animate and inanimate, but it has left its traces deeply engraven upon the Anti-Mosaic history of the world. Geologists tell us they discover in the succession of rocks which enter into the formation of the earth a gradual and regular progression from the simplest form of being, with utter destitution of either animal or vegetable life, up to the modern or superficial formation prepared, with the most exquisite proofs of designed adaptation, as the residence of man. And with the developement of the successive coatings of the earth's surface there has marched along an equal and corresponding developement of the orders and grades of being amongst the earth's inhabitants. Beginning with the coralline, the starfish, some of the lower kinds of shellfish, and a few others found in the lower stratified rocks, we ascend higher and higher—each class and each formation, indeed, perfect in itself, and evidencing a distinct creation, but still at each epoch a higher order rising into life—until we arrive at that period when, the earth all adorned in its surpassing beauty, man came forth from the Creating Hand, causing "the morning stars to sing together, and the sons of God to shout for joy."

And then, when we come to read the more recent history of the

earth, beginning with the birth-day of man downwards to the present time, we find the same all-effective principle, in every department of our inquiries, constantly unfolding the unexhausted and inexhaustible energies of nature. Look at the drained morasses, the cleared forests, the once sterile sand-banks, and the barren heaths, now bringing forth "some sixty and some a hundred fold" for the sustenance of the human family. Look at the great change effected in the seasons and the average states of temperature, as they appear upon a comparison with past records, from which it is clear we have approached many degrees to the genial warmth of the tropics. Look, in short, where you will, and you see advancement in all nature—an approach, as it were, to Eden-loveliness and perfection.

Nor is it material nature alone which has thus progressed, but also masses of men, society as a whole. Think of the hordes of Tartary and Sclavonia, the tribes of Germany, the Saxon, and the Celt—the fathers of modern Europe—think of them in their wildness, their freedom, their bloodthirstiness, the keepers of cattle, the hunters of the forest, the inhabitants of mud cabins and wicker cottages, and then look at their sons, who ransack the bowels of the earth for their pleasure, who make all nature contribute to their enjoyments, who travel as fast as the wind, and who despatch their thoughts with the rapidity of the lightnings of heaven. We say, then, progression, developement is the universal law.

But when man has attained to this general, this social developement, has he reached his ultimate destiny? Does it remain for him thereafter to become stationary—to enjoy the present good, and then, like the gaudy tulip, when it has bloomed, to fade away and die? Or, is this very social perfection but the ministrant to higher powers—the occasion and the preparation of a nobler developement? There cannot be two answers, when we glance at man's nature—when we look at his aspirations, his tendencies, his powers. Surely these were given him in vain if he were only meant for the earth. Why so much waste of ethereal fire? Why not limit his capacities to his duties? Why inspire longings for the Infinite never to be gratified? Why should he be the only creature in which the Divine Artificer has overdone his intents? If, then, man has higher destinies than he can find on earth, every earthly condition, every temporal good, every social state, is valuable just in proportion to its power, and is to be tried and tested by its power of promoting these higher destinies. And since these destinies consist in the full participation of the presence and glory of God, through an assimilation to the Divine character, and since this assimilation is to be attained by the exaltation and perfection of his powers—the developement of the energies, capabilities, and tendencies of his spiritual being—it will follow that the developement of man, simply considered as man, is the object to which all other powers of nature are subordinated, and the law of his developement must be the supreme law amongst the ordinances of God. And, then, as man, as a whole, can only arrive at this ultimate perfection by the developement of man as an individual, we have the supreme and primal importance and authority of the law of Individual Developement.

We arrive at the same conclusion by following out the principles and tendencies of Christianity. It is its peculiar glory and emphatic praise that it invests the individual being—the man as such—with a dignity, an importance, a value in comparison with which the whole world is utterly insignificant. "What," said our Divine Master, "what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Or what shall he give in exchange for his soul?" Whatever may be the mode in which you understand this question, the answer must involve the transcendent value of man above everything that the earth affords—with all its riches, its dignities, its civilizations, its enjoyments, it cannot purchase a single human spirit; and, consequently, the conditions of that spirit's well-being are of infinitely higher moment than any other object whatsoever. This truth became, as it were, an impassioned principle in our Saviour's life; or, rather it was the principle which, in one sense, may be said to have ruled his life: his journeyings, his teaching, his miracles, his groans in Gethsemane, his sorrows and death on Calvary, all emanated from it. And when his Apostles had caught his Spirit, they went forth in labours, in fastings, in dangers, in persecutions oft; and with a zeal which the most dreadful death could not quench, they devoted themselves to this one simple object—"That they might save *some*." Before such a Spirit, what did luxuries and ease become?—what were gold and gems?—what were crowns and sceptres? Childish tinsel, painted gewgaws. The interests of the man, the individual man—his life, his salvation, his absorption into the godlike—the slave man as the free, the serf man as his lord, man without distinction of caste or condition—these were its gems, its gold, its crowns, its all in all. Hence, with Christianity the conditions and the law of Individual Developement are of paramount importance; whatever wars with them comes into direct collision with it.

What, then, are the conditions of this law of Individual Developement? Under what circumstances does it act most efficiently? The following particulars contain the answer:—

1st. Individual security is absolutely necessary to Individual Developement—by which I mean freedom from all oppression, injustice, robbery. It is easy to see if a man be in hourly danger of being spoiled of the fruits of his work by any lawless and rapacious invader he will not work—he has no inducement to it—he will abandon himself to sloth; or, if he do work, his whole energies will be devoted to the devising of means to secure himself from aggression—to ward off the attacks of his enemies. No time will be left for the cultivation and exercise of the higher powers of his nature. Hence, impelled by this necessity, men, early in the history of the world, formed themselves into combinations, which speedily grew up into states and kingdoms, for the purpose of obtaining, by mutual protection, this individual security. I do not mean that these combinations were entered into in all cases formally, but actually, in one mode or another; so that the protection of all the members became the first object and duty of the combination, and thus of the government through which it acted.

2ndly. Individual liberty is another essential condition of this law —by which is meant something more than mere freedom from lawless aggression—viz., the power of acting, when, where, and in what mode we please, without let, hinderance, or annoyance, so long as we do not trespass upon the rights and liberties of others; and I mean the power of action exercised by the thought as well as the physical organs. If a man were not permitted to act just in the direction and in the mode which he chose, it is very possible he might be unable to act in any other—or, at least, in any other so efficiently. His very free choice of that particular direction, or mode, shows that it is natural to him, and, therefore, proper for him; and when you deny it him, you do him an injury, inasmuch as you prevent the developement of his full strength and capabilities—you send him back upon himself, and henceforth compel him to act artificially, which in all cases must be to act weakly.

3rdly. Another condition is individual independence—by which we mean dependence alone upon one's own resources, powers, and energies for any good. It is opposed to the attitude of looking away for help to external agents and powers. It implies if a man want anything, he must get it for himself—if he want anything done, he must do it for himself. If e. g. he want a truth in any science, secular or religious, he must think it out. If he want a reformation, he must excite it. When a man has a help at hand in every difficulty, of course he will resort to it. We are all naturally inclined to indolence; or, at all events, we never think it worth while to exert ourselves, if we can be just as well supplied without exertion. But without exertion no power will be developed; and, therefore, a state of independence is necessary to the developement of the man.

4thly. The last condition I notice is motive, or an inducement sufficiently stringent to arouse a man to action—the action which is necessary to exercise, enlarge, and strengthen his various faculties and powers. Not one man in a thousand could be induced to enter upon a course of self-developement for its own sake. You must, therefore, have some tangible good to present to his mind as an object which he will consider worth seeking; and then, by the action called forth to obtain that object, he will be exercising—that is, developing himself, his powers, unwittingly, perhaps, but surely and perfectly. Acting upon this consideration, our Creator has made the possession of even temporal enjoyments for the most part to depend upon ourselves—"The soul of the sluggard desireth and hath nothing, but the soul of the diligent shall be made fat"—not that He attaches any importance to the work done by us; and, so far as that is concerned, He might just as well have put the object of desire into the hands of the sluggard, as into the hands of the diligent; but knowing our natural indifference to the strengthening and maturing of our powers, and knowing that it is only by this we could be raised to the condition He has destined us to enjoy, He has most wisely and graciously made our enjoyments to depend on our industry; that whilst pursuing the enjoyment for which we do care, we might be, at the same time, developing our powers for which we do not care.

Thus, then, I say, there must, for the most part, be some other motive with the generality of men than that which is found in the mere result of mental developement, in order to call it forth. Not that the sanctions which God has attached to this law are insignificant in themselves—but they are such as are likely to occur only to the minds of the more reflecting, and to impress those whose energies are already aroused.

But having thus glanced at the principal conditions or requirements of this law of Individual Developement, let us refer, for a few moments, to its sanctions. On the one hand, they present to the obedient the highest and very noblest good a creature can enjoy; on the other, they present to the disobedient the most fearful catastrophe. Enter upon this course of self-enlargement, of self-elevation, and there are no bounds prescribed to you by your Maker: each successive step in your progress—by a law which we not long since explained in a discourse upon the talents—will become the vantage-ground from which you will be prepared to advance to another; each additional strength obtained will become the instrument for obtaining more—rising, and yet rising to a higher position—knowledge, pouring in from every direction upon your enlarged capacities, and yet still farther enlarging them: the going forth of your energies, not wasting but still accumulating power; your moral and religious principles expanding indefinitely—you shall thus realise the glorious promise held out by the Apostle, of becoming "partakers of the Divine nature"—a bliss, a greatness, a grandeur ineffable and beyond our utmost present conception. On the other hand, sink down in repose, fold your arms in careless ease, abandon yourself to the guidance and help of others, make no use of the powers God has given you, and soon you shall have none to use: the dim and flickering light of your minds shall go out in darkness—the sport of circumstances, you will be drawn into the vortex of destruction—light chaff before the wind—an empty bubble upon the ocean—without power, without strength, without a soul, on, on you will be borne by the ruthless hand of time—whither? I dare not think. I shut the scene out from sight—an undone mind!

But, having heard out the operation of this law, in its effects upon individuals, we must turn to the consideration of its effects upon communities. If it be of that paramount importance which we have ascribed to it—if it have such tremendous effects upon the characters and destinies of individuals, then may we safely conclude it must have a marked and determinate influence upon the societies or states which those individuals compose—since the aggregate or whole cannot be otherwise than are its parts. And, accordingly, when we refer to the pages of history, we find this to have been precisely the case. The periods of great individual energy and developement have always ushered in the periods of advanced social and national greatness. Look, for instance, at France in the age of Louis XIV.; look at Scotland and England from the reign of Elizabeth to the end of the Commonwealth: and look at the Church in the time of the Reformation, and at the Church in England in the time of Whitfield and Wesley.

All these various historical epochs and facts will confirm the assertion, that Individual Developement will determine communal and national greatness and prosperity. But it is a fact so apparently obvious, that we need not now spend any further time on its proof.

If, however, this be granted—as granted it must be—then it will follow that, as social, national, or religious institutions affect Individual Development, so will they, so must they, affect the communal and national condition. If they promote this developement, *by the act*, they conduce to the communal and national prosperity; if they retard or hinder it, then as surely must they involve in communal and national ruin. Let us, then, now direct our attention to existing institutions in this country, and, by ascertaining their relation to the law of Individual Developement, we may be able to discover what influence they have had in reducing us to our present national condition.

I. We turn to the several Protestant Churches, and must pass them as briefly as possible under review. We do not require, however, in order to answer our purpose, to look at each section distinctly, but may consider them as a whole, under three different aspects:—as the medium of conveying the Divine life and spirit of Christianity—as the expounders and conservators of religious dogmas—and as sustaining certain external relations to the community and State.

And, in the first place, as the medium of conveying the Divine life and spirit of Christianity, so far forth as they have been a medium, their influence, doubtless, must have been healthful and beneficial; because there is no power so quickening, so elevating, so conducive to the highest developement of man's faculties, as the genuine spirit of Christianity; and, therefore, no power so calculated to impart that strength in action, that energy in enterprise, and that prudence and wisdom in general arrangement, which are the sure prestige of national prosperity. And we delight to confess that to each and all of these Churches in greater or less degrees, must be awarded the honour of having been the medium, through which this Divine spirit of Christianity has been conveyed. Not, however, through the Churches as aggregate bodies, but through the individuals, or some of the individuals of which they are composed; and this, because the spirit of Christianity resides not in aggregate bodies, but in the hearts of individuals, as a living power developing itself through their inward, and thence through their outward life. And hence, too, these individuals of these different Churches have derived this spirit of Christianity from their glorious Head, and have diffused its influences, notwithstanding their diversities and various creeds; for this spirit being a life, and not a form or a letter, rises superior to all forms and all dogmas, and exists or may exist independently, or in spite of them. At the same time it is most clearly true that dogmas and forms not only mould the outward manifestation of the spirit of Christianity, but also, in a measure, determine the influence it exerts through the subjects of it, over the minds of others, and the strength of it own internal energy. It needs, therefore, caution in allotting to these different Churches their due meed of praise for

the influence their members have exerted in favour of the pure spirit of Christianity, as it is not impossible this influence may have been put forth in complete independency of, or it may even be in direct opposition to, their own proper tendencies: their only natural and proper tendency may have been to thwart and destroy it. But this subject will be more apparent after subsequent reflections.

In the second place, we have to consider these Churches as the conservators and expounders of religious dogmas. Doubtless, in the present state of the religious mind of the country, it is necessary to state and defend the truth under a dogmatical form; and no one can have thought very seriously upon the subject who does not attach a high importance to the clearness and accuracy with which the truth is stated. But, at the same time, most gross would be our error if we supposed the power of the spirit of Christianity resided in those dogmatical statements, or that they, in themselves, possess any power. Christianity, as we have just said, is not a dogma or a form—it is a living influence, derived from Him who is the Life and the Truth; and, therefore, these dogmas can only be of value as they become the channels through which this influence is conveyed to us, and through which we ascend immediately and directly to the great eternal Fountain of Life. But then it is impossible that they should become even this, excepting as they are the expressions of Life—the creations or the productions of it; i. e. as they are the accurate and natural expressions of a Living Soul. Thus it is that the words of the late Dr. Arnold come to us with such power; they were his own words, welling up from the depths within him. And thus it is, to take a far higher and, indeed, an incomparable instance, the words of our Saviour have over us so omnipotent an influence: they come to us from the innermost recesses of his mind—and that mind so divine!

Now it is in this point precisely that we conceive the majority of the Protestant Churches to have failed, and to have exerted a prejudicial influence upon our Individual Developement. Perceiving the force of religious dogmas, when the strong and earnest utterances of the Living Soul, they have fallen into the mistake of supposing the power lay in the dogmas, and hence have devoted their chief attention to the elaboration and defence of certain creeds. These creeds are, in some instances, according to truth, and in others at variance with it—and I say this without making my own mind the standard, simply from their variance with each other; but whether right or wrong, immediately they pass from the originators, and become simply the formal expressions of other men, they lose their vitality, or rather their function of being the medium through which vitality is conveyed, and become lifeless and pestiferous forms. Their conservators and expounders, of necessity, must lose all naturalness in their teachings, and, unless, indeed, they are eminently artistic, thus unfortunately convey to the public the impression of insincerity. And I make these statements with confidence, because of the known and acknowledged truth, that the facts of Christianity, like all other facts, must make different impressions on different minds, according to their previous states and conditions, their various amount of know-

ledge, and the different aspects under which the truths are viewed; and therefore must, of necessity, demand a different mode of expression, in words or in arrangements of words. Hence, then, by prescribing the precise lines of a man's faith, you make him artificial, and thus prevent the free outgoing of the Living Spirit which may, perchance, be within him, and so forbid its quickening influence upon those to whom he addresses himself, and their consequent Individual Developement.

But the injurious effects of this enacting of creeds upon the Individual Developement of man are seen still more forcibly when we consider how peremptorily it refuses the conditions of the operation of the law. You recollect we stated four conditions necessary to it—Motive, Independence, Liberty, and Security. They are all either directly or indirectly forbidden by erecting any other standard of faith than the Word of God. But as our time is limited, we now just take two, Independence and Liberty, as illustrations of the others.

We showed you that without individual independence there could be no Individual Developement, because the action necessary to it would not be called forth. Now this is precisely the case, as seen in the influence of creeds: the higher powers of man's nature, his purest reason and understanding, his habits of moral judgment and decision are left to run waste, to become nerveless by inaction. The man is not necessitated to the wholesome toil of searching out truth for himself—it is put into his hand ready manufactured—he has simply to receive it—if he can place sufficient confidence in the reason, the judgment of the Church which offers it, all his work is done. It saves him, indeed, much anxiety and pain, and watchful nights, and restlessness of spirit, and aching of head, and bleeding of heart; but then there is no exaltation and maturing of God's most precious gifts—there is no calling forth of the powers which ally him the most closely with the celestial, and raise him farthest above the brute. So far as his religion is concerned, his Creator might as well have only endowed him with the power of belief—his reason, in its highest sense, is utterly useless, or worse than useless. And, accordingly, you find there is no self-reliance in men who submit to the imposition of creeds—they must be led—all they can do is to follow—to repeat accurately their lesson. Their teacher can guide them as he will.

And then, when we turn to the other mentioned condition of Individual Developement—Individual Liberty—we find creeds acting in the same detrimental way. The Church which has imposed one, virtually forbids its members to think. For if they do think, it is certain they cannot, with a sincere and hearty purpose, sign all the various articles of the creed: there will sure to be something in the stating of dogmas, if not in the dogmas themselves, from which the mind will dissent. What, then, must be the consequence, unless the creed be allowed to lie as a dead letter? These individuals must undergo the painful penalty of separation from the body in which their affections centre, and with which, upon the whole and essentially, they agree; besides which they immediately lose caste, and become

the victims of, if it be not a contradiction in terms, a civilised persecution. The result, therefore, is that, under such circumstances, the men do not think on the subjects to which their creed relates; they are obliged to lose the benefit of the most purifying and exalting exercise within the range of our action; they are necessitated to become dwarfed and stunted souls. The only remedy, in such a case, is worse than the disease—to think, to differ, and then conceal it, either by a violence to their moral nature through an artful employment in a different sense of the authorised terms, or by an abuse of their sincerity and a destruction of their power, through a careful avoidance of all reference to the subject. In either case an injury is done to their nature, and an essential condition of their Individual Developement is refused.

And all these remarks come with redoubled force, when the creed is the composition of past generations; because, the force and shades of meaning expressed by words unavoidably changing with the change of times, even if the same ideas be retained, there must, of necessity, in order to express them, be a change of expression. There is, indeed, just one condition upon which it can be supposed an antique creed can be made to fit a modern mind: i. e. by stripping the mind of all its associations, shutting it up in the study, and there permitting it to converse only with the men of the past. In such a case we can conceive of its becoming so imbued with all their prejudices and feelings, their oddities and quiddities, that their creed shall bec ome a tolerable expression of its belief. And if you can meet with a Church willing to submit to these conditions, then, so far as the law of Individual Developement is concerned, only the objections we have stated to arise from the refusal of naturalness, independence, and liberty, can be urged against it, on account of its imposition on its members of a creed.*

In the third place, we have to consider these Protestant Churches in their relation to the community and the State. As corporate and

* To those who cannot understand how a Church can be formed without a creed as the bond of union, allow me to commend the following *covenant*, copied from the records of the Independent Church, Norwich, and entered into June 28, 1643:—

"It is manifest by God's Word, that God alwaies was pleased to walke in a way of co-u-enant with his people, He promising to be their God, and they promising to be His people, separated from the world, and the pollutions thereof, as may appeare.—Deut. xxix. 10, 11; Isaiah lvi. 3, &c.; Acts v. 13.

"We, therefore, whose names are underwritten, being desirous (in the feare of God) to worship and serve Him according to his reuealed will, and believing it to be our duty to walke in a way of Church couenant, doe freely, solemnly, and jointly couenant with the Lord, in the presence of his saints and angels.

"1. That we will for ever acknowledge and auouch God for our God, in Christ Jesus.

"2. That we will alwaies endeauour, through the grace of God assisting us, to walke in all His ways and ordinances according to His written word, which is the only sufficient rule of good life for euery man. Neither will we suffer ourselues to be polluted by any sinfull ways, either publike or priuate, but abstain from euer appearance of euil, giuing no offence to the Jew or Gentile, or Churches of Christ.

"3. That we will, in all loue, improue our com'union as brethren, by watching ouer one another, and (as need shall be) counsell, admonish, reproue, releeue, assist, and beare with one another, humbly submitting ourselues to the gouernment of Christ in the Churches.

"Lastly, we doe not couenant or promise these things in our owne, but in Christ's strength; *neither doe we confine ourselues to the Words of this couenant, but shall, at all times account it our duty to embrace any further light or truth which shall be reuealed to us out of God's Word.*"

associated bodies, they must, of necessity, exert a certain influence upon the whole community, and appear in certain aspects towards the State. What have been these aspects and this influence?

Let the still bleeding wounds, once inflicted by the penal laws upon a down-trodden and afflicted people, speak! Let the desperate struggle which, in seeking their sacred and indefeasable rights, they have had, and still have, in a measure, to sustain, with a party composed of the members of these Churches, speak! Nay, let the whole of the past history of this country speak! Wherever and whenever have these Churches been discovered manifesting any generous sympathies with the lower classes of the people? What have they done to lift them up from the lower depths of humanity to the possession of manhood, of independence, of the dignity of which God has made them capable? Whenever have they denounced the injustice and oppression of the hard taskmaster, the legalised spoiler, and the ruthless tyrant? And shall we feel surprised at their course? Shall we not rather pity their condition? for who could expect the hireling to turn against his Lord? and is not the servant bound to consul tthe wishes of his master? It is true, some of the Churches have been free; but their numbers have been too small to make it worth while to take them into the account; or their sympathies too much identified with the enslaved, to make their conduct an exception.

By, then, their connexions with the State, these Churches have destroyed the independence of their own members; they have forced them into the attitude and condition of dependence; they have taught them to look to the State to do that which their own bounden duty required themselves to perform; and they have deprived them of the liberty which their welfare demanded they should enjoy—deprived them of their liberty, we mean, by forcing them into that connexion with the State, through which common decency, as well as clearly-understood stipulations, required they should confine their actions to that course consistent with the wishes of those who composed the strength of the State.

And then, by thus mixing themselves up and identifying themselves with the system which so long ruled this land, they aided and abetted in withholding from the people at large the essential conditions of the law of Individual Developement—security, liberty, independence, and motive; and thus cruelly put their veto upon its operation. Upon the whole, then, in looking back upon the history of the Protestant Churches in this country in relation to the law of Individual Developement, we have the painful conviction forced upon us, that they have stood in its way, or have directly opposed it. There have been exceptions, it is true; and, from individuals associated with all sections, there have gone forth influences to bless, to vivify, to elevate; but these exceptions have existed in opposition to the tendencies of the communities in which they have been found, and have had to contend with these tendencies in every step of their progress. Upon the communities themselves must be passed the sentence of utter condemnation. Their system has been radically bad, with scarcely a single redeeming feature.

And you feel this truth the more deeply when you think of what they might have been, and what they might have done, had they right earnestly and religiously fulfilled their mission. A high-minded, enthusiastic, and generous people to work upon—in the Gospel of Jesus Christ an instrumentality to work with, capable of raising and elevating all the nations of the earth to the highest moral and spiritual grandeur—and in the motto which they have chosen as their watchword—"the right of private judgment"—a truth which ought to have directed them into the right course:—with these advantages, had they humbly followed the footsteps of Christ, and acted up to their own high pretensions, no earthly power could have resisted their prowess; Ireland would have long since been regenerated—her sons would now lift up their heads amongst the nations of the earth as men. But, alas! they have preferred a selfish, cold-hearted policy; they have danced attendance at courts, when, with the Bible in hand, they should have been ministering in the cottages of the poor; and they have been craving and wheedling for an increase to their own aggrandisement, when they should have been training and educating the powers of those committed to their care. Oh, fearful must be the reckoning for such guilt!

II. We now proceed to consider the remaining great religious institution of the country, in its relation to this law of Individual Developement. Nor does it require much and elaborate discussion to put the subject in what we conceive to be its true light. Roman Catholicism is generally denounced, by us Protestants, as a great apostacy from Christianity; and the time when and the circumstances under which it first began, have been pointed out with a great appearance of accuracy. And, doubtless, when compared *doctrinally* with true Christianity, considered as deriving its life from Christ, and as exemplified in the writings of the New Testament, such it is. There can be no question that Roman Catholicism, as embodied in the decrees and writings of the Roman Catholic Church, and as acted out in her forms and institutions, and Christianity, as embodied in the person of Christ, and as acted out by the Apostles and first converts, are two different things. But to me it is equally unquestionable that Roman Catholicism, considered *historically*, is no apostacy at all, but in its early periods was actually a progression. Of course, it would be foreign to our subject to argue this point now; but in two or three words it may be simply stated thus: When a heathen man became a convert to Christianity, we are not to suppose all his heathenish prejudices, modes of thought and feeling, habits, moral and physical, would, at once, and immediately, be eradicated and destroyed; they would still survive, only mingled with and controlled by a new element—viz., his Christianity. With this modified Christianity, then, he would enter the Church. At first the predominating influence of the Jewish party would prevent the outward exhibition of this heathenish element; but, as the number of converts increased, it would obtain a greater strength of expression, till eventually, by the subjugation of whole nations professedly to the faith, this element would gain the complete ascendancy. Now, you may

call this state of things an apostacy if you like, and so in the sense in which I have before explained it, it was; but if you look upon it historically, in relation to the people themselves, it was a progression —a progression from the grossness of heathenism to a form of Christianity, imperfect, undefined, having much of corruptness mingled with it, but still a form infinitely better than that from which they had emerged. Where, then, I impute wrong to the Roman Catholic Church is, not in having come into this peculiar position, for I think that was inevitable, but in having rested there—in having adopted the foolish principle of infallibility, which at once put an arrest upon all the further progress through which they might have arrived, long before this, at a much higher position than that to which we have attained. I look upon the Roman Catholic Church as a creature stunted in its growth—as altogether a thing of the past, which has failed to advance with the times. Now, if she were merely this, she would be utterly powerless for evil or for good; but she is something more—she has many Christian principles interwoven in her system, and she is founded on many strong elements of human nature. These two facts give her a hold upon her members—secure them safe in her communion. But, then, instead of leading them forward, developing their powers by a careful nurture, teaching them to exercise the inde pendence of manhood, she watches over them with a jealous eye; progress with her is treason—it would arouse elements of their nature more powerful than those upon which she is founded—it would excite a demand for those Christian principles which she has not to give, which she never advanced far enough to reach: and, therefore, she stands forth everywhere as the determined and avowed opponent of free thought, of mental progress beyond a most limited sphere, and thus of Individual Developement. As far as her power and authority extend, she refuses every condition requisite to the action of the law.

In the predominant religious institutions of this country, then, we find a constant tendency to oppose and hinder the developement of the individual man. His noblest powers may lie dormant—his highest faculties remain uncultivated, so far as they are concerned. He must look to some other source for the strength and help he needs.

We have left ourselves but little time to consider, in this relation, the influence of our national and social institutions; nor is it now necessary. The course of observation we have already passed over enables you readily to perceive the one we should have pursued in reference to these topics; and the conditions of Individual Developement we have laid down, furnish you with the means by which you may test for yourselves the tendency of these institutions to promote or impede that developement. It will suffice for us now to say, that as regards our national regulations and arrangements we look upon them for the most part as opposed to the higher interests of the individual. In the tendency to accumulate power and responsibility in the government—to make it the source and ce ntre of all influence and action—the heart, whence the streams of life shall go forth to the uttermost ends of the nation—in short, in what is termed the system

of centralization, a system illustrated in the poor-law, the educational scheme, the lately proposed health of towns bill, and many others—I discern a refusal of the conditions of Individual Developement—a tendency to take away the independence of the man and to make us all children walking in leading-strings, and looking up with infantile simplicity to the fostering care of a parental government. And, as regards our social economics, whether established by law or by circumstances, I discern, for the most part, the same tendencies. The poor-law, considered, not in its relation to government, but as a certain provision for the destitute, and the relations of landlord and tenant, are amongst the most striking instances. By both are individual security and independence violated; and so by both, is a barrier thrown in the way of Individual Developement. *

*I had not time to illustrate these statements in the Discourse : I may be permitted, however, to do so now.

First, with regard to the Poor-law. Considered as a certain provision for the destitute, derived by general taxation, there appears to me a most direct and pernicious tendency to destroy the spirit of independence amongst the working classes. In England, especially in the rural districts, where the law has fully developed itself, this effect, notwithstanding the numerous counteractive causes long in operation, is most painfully evident. Instead of, by acts of self-denial and economy during the times of plenty and prosperity, preparing for the hour of sickness and commercial depression, the conviction that a provision may always be claimed from the parish induces the habits of indulgence, sensualism, and sloth, and thus prevents the exercise of those higher faculties which constitute the dignity of the man. But Dr. Chalmers has, I understand, so ably argued this point that I need do no more than refer to his treatise upon the subject.

There is, however, another ground upon which I object to this law, and that is, its injustice to the hard-working and the industrious classes of the community. Upon what principle, I ask, am I, as one living by my toil, bound to support the man too idle to earn his own bread? Why, when, by arts of thriftiness and prudence, I have laid up a sufficiency to sustain me after I have become incapable of work, should the hand of the law be laid upon my earnings, and compel me to divide them with the man who has spent his upon a base and degrading appetite? It is a foul act of injustice; and so far as its tendencies in economics are concerned, is of the same character as if the pauper were allowed to enter upon my premises, and wrest from me by violence what he required for his support. In other words, it is a denial of the first condition of Individual Developement—Individual Security.

But, perhaps it it will be said—"This is an abuse or a misdirection of the law : that it ought to tax only the rich or the wealthy lords of the soil." Does the amount of a man's property, then, affect the quality of an action that is committed against him? Does a burglar cease to be a thief if he merely plunder the houses of the rich? "Nay ; but should not the land be required to support those who live upon it?" What can be meant by such a question? Hundreds of acres would not support a dozen individuals unless human labour were first spent upon them. Is it meant then that all the industrious and hard-working, living within a certain district, are to support the idle or the extravagant who happen to be born or reside within the same boundaries? If so, this is the point we have already disposed of.

But we must not enlarge: Look where we will we discern institutions, systems, regulations, at war with the mind of man—his higher life: tending to animalize his nature, and to prevent the developement of his noblest faculties—those faculties which, if rightly directed, lead him on to God, to the enjoyment of his likeness, the lustrous glory of the perfect day.

"But," it may be rejoined, "Those who reap the larger portion of the fruits of labour are not the labourers themselves, but the landlords, who came by their property, in the first instance, by violence and rapine; surely, then, it would not be wrong to compel these to support the poor?" I humbly submit it is too late to enter into the question of the mode in which men came by their properties; it could not be touched without exciting the worst species of revolution. To call in doubt a man's absolute right to a possession which has been in the hands of his ancestors for ages, confirmed to him by prescription and laws innumerable, because the first of those ancestors was a bandit and obtained it by force, would be to root up all the foundations of society, and to mingle in one wild and irreducible disorder all its elements. None would suffer from such a catastrophe more than the poor themselves. The landlords, then, who have obtained their property by inheritance, must be considered to have as good and as secure a right in it as those who have only just purchased out of the savings of their labour. But if so, what is this property—what is any property—but an accumulation of the fruits of labour? To compel the landlords, therefore, to support the poor, would be the injustice which we have before contended against—the injustice of making labour support indolence and imprudence—and so a violation of individual security.

"What, then, shall we do with the poor? Must we leave them to starve?" Dr. Chalmers has shown that unconstrained individual charity would be found all-sufficient to meet the cases of the really indigent and deserving; and as to the rest, it is only by suffering the consequences of wrong-doing that men generally can be taught the necessity of acting in invariable accordance with those immutable laws under which our Creator has placed us: and for my part, I am daily more firmly convinced that it is no true benevolence to do anything to weaken the force of the lesson which the natural operations of those laws inculcate. But at the same time do not let us be guilty of the hypocrisy and cruelty of refusing injustice to the taxpayers, whilst we allow it to the working classes. If we deny them all hope of parochial relief let us first remove all those fiscal and commercial restrictions which prevent the full developement of their energies. Clear the ground for them—for us all; keep the government within its own province, and do not let it be perpetually and provokingly meddling with our individual affairs; give us full liberty to work, where, when, and how we please—and we ask no more.

Secondly, with regard to the *tenant-right*, I have only a few words to add. That there has been long in existence some undefined but generally acknowledged co-partnership between the landlord and tenant in Ulster there can be no doubt; and the sooner it is fully ascertained, and their mutual claims are adjusted by law, the better and more satisfactory will it be for both parties. But whether the enacting of a law for the whole country upon the principle which seems generally understood by *tenant-right*, would be an act of justice and beneficial, I am more than doubtful. It would be a positive violation of individual security, and a gross infraction of the first requirements of a well established political economy.

We do not wonder, therefore, that we are involved in so much suffering and misery. Under the influences bearing upon us, we have failed in attaining the maturity of men; we have lived under the control of prejudices, mistakes, absurdities becoming only the childhood of our race; we have never yet attained to that state of de-

Allow me to state the case thus:—I have earned enough money to purchase a farm, say of 100 acres, and carrying it into the market I put it up for hire to the highest bidder. A comes forward and offers me £3 per acre, but requires upon his quitting the occupancy to be re-imbursed for any outlay upon its improvement. B advances and bids the same rent, but is willing to leave behind him the capital he may expend upon the land. Now what would a law disallowing me to take this advanced bid be but a re-enaction of those old and now laughed-at regulations by which our forefathers sought to fix the minimum and maximum prices of goods brought into the market? Why should I not be permitted to make the most of my capital that it will fetch? "Oh, but the injustice to the farmer in compelling him to leave behind his property!" And who compels him? Is it not his own offer, prompted by his desire to outbid those competing with him in the market? and if, in his eagerness, he overstep the bounds of prudence and wise calculation, must we have acts of parliament to save him from his folly? The fact, however, is, that this outlaid capital has ceased to be his. It exists as a sort of accumulated rent, which he pays over to the landlord upon giving up his tenancy. And were an act passed to-morrow, enjoining that henceforth the landlord should restore this capital, he would not be in the least degree benefited, but must pay the value in another form. Under the present system, when he makes his hire, having calculated the whole produce of the farm, he has to divide it into three parts —*A*, *B*, *C*. *A* represents the portion he allots for his currrent expenses and profits; *B*, the portion he is obliged to lay by to replace his capital; and *C*, the portion which goes for rent. Now supposing a law enacted, requiring the landlord to replace this capital, the only difference it would make to him would be, that, instead of taking charge of B himself, he would have to hand it over to his landlord, in the form of C, to be restored when he gives up his holding—would he be profited? He would leave his own capital behind him, sunk in the land as heretofore; and what he would receive back as compensation, he must previously hand over to his landlord for the purpose—in fact the whole effect of the law would be to simply make the landlord his banker. But perhaps some one who has not thought upon the subject may say, "he would not have to hand over *C* as rent, he would retain it as a part of his profits." If so, with what would he be able to outbid his competitors in the farm market? Is it not evident he can only do so by the investment of capital upon improvements, or by increased rent? If the legislature, therefore, enforce anything like the measures which have been proposed, rents must rise; the condition of the farmer will remain the same.

We would reject, then, as worse than useless—as tending to unsettle the stability of property—as a violation of individual security and liberty, all such peddling legislative attempts to regulate the price of land, the nature of the bargains men shall form with each other in the affairs of life, and, therefore, the arrangements between landlord and tenant. All these things can only be controlled by higher laws than those of senates—the laws of political economy—which are the laws of God.

velopement necessary to the just and due apperception and appreciation of the great laws of nature ; and the consequence has been, the infliction of the punishment the violation of those laws always entails. A fully developed mind can alone make us a strong and a vigorous nation.

But it will be in vain for us to look for help in this developement from our religious, national, or social institutions: it must be effected by our own energies. This very Individual Developement is itself a condition of any reform in these institutions : it must first be attained. We must abandon, then, all reliance upon foreign aid ; it may temporarily amend, but it cannot permanently redeem. We must ourselves resolve to rise above all adverse circumstances—to become superior to all existing institutions ; and, with a true heart, and with patient toil, work our way upwards by the diligent exercise of our own powers.

And blessed be the great and glorious name of our God! He has not left us to depend upon the mere strength which is in the Human Will : but in His own all-effective operation, in those undeviating and immutable laws under which he has placed us, he has given us the pledge and assurance, that whilst we, in conformity with the requirements of those laws put forth our strength to work out our own salvation, He will "work in us to will and to do of His own good pleasure."

Nor can I so far forget the peculiar functions of my office as to close this all-important subject without directing your attention to the omnipotent instrumentality we possess in the pure and genuine spirit of Christianity to raise and elevate the mind of man. An individual possessed of this spirit becomes at once superior to the adverse influences by which he is surrounded. The hopes it excites arouse every energy of his soul, leading him on to the pursuit of the sublime and purifying objects of eternity, to exercise and develop every faculty as to fit him perfectly to understand and discharge the duties of this life: thus realising the truth, that GODLINESS HATH THE PROMISE OF THE LIFE WHICH NOW IS, AS WELL AS OF THAT TO COME.

ACHILLI *v.* NEWMAN.

A FULL AND AUTHENTIC REPORT

OF THE ABOVE

PROSECUTION FOR LIBEL,

TRIED BEFORE LORD CAMPBELL AND A SPECIAL JURY,

IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, WESTMINSTER, JUNE, 1852.

With Introductory Remarks,

BY THE EDITOR OF

"THE CONFESSIONAL UNMASKED."

LONDON: W. STRANGE, JUN., 8, AMEN CORNER;

AND MAY BE HAD OF ALL BOOKSELLERS.

PRICE EIGHTPENCE.

PREFACE.

The melancholy exhibition which has just been witnessed in the Court of Queen's Bench (detailed in the following Report), is a fit subject for humiliating reflection to those who have been indulging the hope that human nature was gradually, though slowly, progressing towards that state of perfection, of which so many are wont to speculate, but of which it is feared the consummation is still distant.

In this remarkable trial it is self-evident that the most determined and wholesale perjury has been practised. It is not that any particular witness on one side has been guilty of it, but that the whole of the witnesses on one side or the other must be guilty of perjury the most flagrant and systematic. Even where there is no temptation to perjury, it is difficult to find half a dozen witnesses agreeing in their evidence; how numerous, therefore, must the *rehearsals* have been preparatory to this unprecedented *performance!*

It is generally the lot of one combatant to come off victorious, but in the present instance only the most mortifying and unsatisfactory results to both parties have been obtained from great exertions and much sacrifice of feeling. In corroboration of this, we cannot here do better than quote the following passage from a most able article in the *Times*, in which the pith of the controversy is condensed:—

"What has either party gained by dragging these revolting details before the public eye? The Protestant supporters of Dr. Achilli have, indeed, succeeded in painting in very forcible colours the known and admitted tendencies of the Church of Rome; they have shown how awfully the superhuman power which Rome places in the hands of weak and fallible mortals may be prostituted and abused. They have shown that, before man shall be permitted to pry into the heart and probe the conscience of his fellow-creatures, he ought to be invested with the perfection as well as the omniscience of the Deity. Little has the victim of this frightful power to hope from the boasted discipline of the Church of Rome. The confessor shrouds the shame of a brother priest under the injunction of eternal silence. The religious orders connive at the delinquencies of a brother whose eloquence can support, and whose teaching edify, the church. If scandal becomes troublesome, a change of residence removes all difficulties, and the church is willing to let the discipline sleep which cannot be enforced without casting obloquy on the priestly character, and exposing the hollowness of the system on which she builds her pretensions and from which she derives her riches. The dreaded Inquisition itself, that name of blood and terror, waxes mild in dealing with merely moral offences, and reserves for heretics penalties which she is too merciful to impose on the erring sons of the church. These things have undoubtedly been presented to us by this remarkable trial in a tangible shape; but who is there so little versed in the history of the Romish Church as to require three days of indecent details in order to convince him that, if weakness has compelled abstinence from her favourite sin of cruelty, the Church of Rome still permits to her ministers scarcely less license than of old in the indulgence of unbridled lust?"—*Times*, June 25, 1852.

For proofs of the statements made in the above extract we beg to refer our readers to a pamphlet lately published, entitled "The Confessional Unmasked," where the principal Romish authorities are quoted in full upon this subject. In that work, from pages 32 to 40, will be found ample extracts *justifying* priests in the commission of all the immoralities which were charged against Dr. Achilli.

Many thousand copies of "The Confessional Unmasked" have been sold within the last few months, and although several Eminent Roman Catholics have perused its pages, not one of them has ever ventured to impugn the accuracy of a single extract contained in it; notwithstanding that a reward has been offered by the Editor to any person (lay or clerical) who can prove him to be in error.

These immoralities are clearly traceable to the unnatural law which compels the celibacy of the Clergy,—a law not only contrary to the teaching and practice of the

Apostles, whose successors they profess to be, but which is also in direct opposition to the xpress command of God.

Dr. Graves, in his comments on the *Pentateuch* (Lev. xviii. 29,) gives the following simple explanation of the Mosaic law in connection with this subject :—

"Next to 'idolatry' the Jewish law seems to have condemned with peculiar emphasis, and punished with peculiar severity, 'all kinds of impurity :' every species of incestuous connexion and unnatural crime was punished with death. Besides, not only was forcible violation capital, as by our law, but the violation of the marriage vow. The adulterer and adulteress were condemned to suffer a public and ignominious execution. The same punishment was the consequence, where the female, though not married, was betrothed in marriage. In a word, we perceive the most anxious care to cut off every greater degree of licentiousness, and stigmatize even the least with infamy: yet never did this care degenerate into an extravagant reverence for unnatural austerity and monastic celibacy. In every rank, from the *high priest* to the lowest peasant, marriage was encouraged, and esteemed honourable: our blessed Lord indeed has declared, that some permissions, relating to marriage, granted to the Jews for the hardness of their hearts, were inconsistent with the more pure and refined morality of the Gospel; yet, notwithstanding this, we perceive in the Jewish law so strong an opposition to the usual licentiousness of Eastern manners, and so decided a superiority in this respect above the legislators and philosophers of the heathen world, and still more above their religious institutions, as tend strongly to prove, that a system so favourable to the interests of virtue, and restraining so powerfully, and yet so judiciously, the excesses of passion; a system, introduced at that early period, in an Eastern climate, and among a people accustomed to be irresistibly led by objects of sense, had higher origin than mere human wisdom; and that, to secure submission to its restraint, required an interference more powerful than mere human authority."

Lest it should be supposed that lewd practices have only crept into the church of late years, or were confined to any particular period, we shall conclude these remarks with an extract from a work entitled "*Popery—its Character and Crimes.*" By W. E. Tayler. London: 1847 :—"The most striking proof, however, afforded of the gross and abominable debauchery of the Bishops, and Clergy, during this century, occurs in the sermon delivered by Cardinal Hugo, at the close of the Council of Lyons, held in the year 1251. The Cardinal Hugo preached to the Council at its breaking up, and in the course of his sermon thus addressed the citizens of Lyons:—'My friends, since we came to this city we have been great benefactors to you, and brought you much gain. For, on our arrival here we found *three or four houses of ill fame*; but at our departure we have left but *one*; it is true that IT *extends through the whole city, and reaches from the east to the west gate.*' So general indeed was the depravity of all the Clergy at this period that we read in the Canon Law, that 'No Priest is to be deposed for simple Fornication, *because there are few to be found innocent of that vice!*' "—pp. 314, 315.

In addition, we may remind our readers of the fearful immoralities practised in the Convents at the time of the Reformation, the exposure of which has long since become matter of history.

We trust that the learned Attorney-General, who has acquitted himself with such consummate ability in this case, will, in the next session of Parliament, introduce "A Bill to remove the present Matrimonial Disabilities of the Romish Clergy."

THE QUEEN ON THE PROSECUTION OF

GIOVANNI GIACINTO ACHILLI,

versus

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, WESTMINSTER.

(*Sittings at Nisi Prius, before Lord* CAMPBELL *and a Special Jury.*)

FIRST DAY.—MONDAY, JUNE 21.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL, the SOLICITOR-GENERAL, and Mr. T. F. ELLIS appeared for the Crown; and Sir A. E. COCKBURN, Mr. SERJEANT WILKINS, Mr. BRAMWELL, Q.C., Mr. ADDISON, and Mr. BADELEY for the defendant.

In Michaelmas term last the Court had granted leave to file a criminal information against the Messrs. Burns and Lambert for a libel published by them against Dr. Achilli in a pamphlet entitled *Lectures on the present Position of Catholics in England, addressed to the Brothers of the Oratory, by John Henry Newman, D.D., Priest of the Congregation of St. Philip Neri. Lecture V. Logical Inconsistency of the Protestant View.* Subsequently, Dr. Newman admitted that he was the author of the libel, and his name by the leave of the Court was substituted for that of the Messrs. Burns and Lambert.

The information set out the libel *verbatim*, with the usual inuendos. The libel was as follows:—

"And in the midst of outrages such as these, my Brothers of the Oratory, wiping its mouth and clasping its hands, and turning up its eyes, it trudges to the Town-hall to hear Dr. Achilli expose the inquisition. Ah! Dr. Achilli, I might have spoken of him last week, had time admitted of it. The Protestant world flocks to hear him, because he has something to tell of the Catholic Church. He has something to tell, it is true; he *has* a scandal to reveal, he *has* an argument to exhibit. It is a simple one, and a powerful one, as far as it goes—and it is *one*. That one argument is himself; it is his presence which is the triumph of Protestants; it is the sight of him which is a Catholic's confusion. It is indeed our confusion, that our Holy Mother could have had a priest like him. He feels the force of the argument, and he shows himself to the multitude that is gazing on him. 'Mothers of families,' he seems to say, 'gentle maidens, innocent children, look at me, for I am worth looking at. You do not see such a sight every day. Can any church live over the

imputation of such a production as I am? I have been a Roman priest and a hypocrite; I have been a profligate under a cowl; I am that Father Achilli, who, as early as 1826, was deprived of my faculty to lecture, for an offence which my superiors did their best to conceal; and who in 1827 had already earned the reputation of a scandalous friar. I am that Achilli, who in the diocese of Viterbo, in February, 1831, robbed of her honour a young woman of eighteen; who, in September, 1833, was found guilty of a second such crime, in the case of a person of twenty-eight; and who perpetrated a third in July, 1834, in the case of another aged twenty-four. I am he, who afterwards was found guilty of sins, similar or worse, in other towns of the neighbourhood. I am that son of St. Dominic who is known to have repeated the offence at Capua, in 1834 and 1835, and at Naples again in 1840, in the case of a child of fifteen. I am he who chose the sacristy of the church for one of these crimes, and Good Friday for another. Look on me, ye mothers of England, a confessor against Popery, for ye 'ne'er may look upon my like again.' I am that veritable priest who, after all this, began to speak against, not only the Catholic faith, but the moral law, and perverted others by my teaching. I am the Cavaliere Achilli, who then went to Corfu, made the wife of a tailor faithless to her husband, and lived publicly and travelled about with the wife of a chorus-singer. I am that Professor in the Protestant College at Malta, who with two others was dismissed from my post for offences which the authorities could not get themselves to describe. And now attend to me, such as I am, and you shall see what you shall see about the barbarity and profligacy of the inquisitors of Rome.' You speak truly, O Achilli, and we cannot answer you a word. You are a priest; you have been a friar; you are, it is undeniable, the scandal of Catholicism, and the palmary argument of Protestants, by your extraordinary depravity. You have been, it is true, a profligate, an unbeliever, and a hypocrite. Not many years passed of your conventual life, and you were never in choir, always in private houses, so that the laity observed you. You were deprived of your professorship, we own it; you were prohibited from preaching and hearing confessions; you were obliged to give hush-money to the father of one of your victims, as we learn from the official report of the police of Viterbo. You are reported in an official document of the Neapolitan police to be 'known for habitual incontinency;' your name came before the civil tribunal at Corfu for your crime of adultery. You have put the crown on your offences by, as long as you could, denying them all; you have professed to seek after truth, when you were ravening after sin. Yes, you are an incontrovertible proof that priests may fall and friars break their vows. You are your own witness; but while you *need* not go out of yourself for your argument, neither are you *able*. With you the argument begins; with you too it ends; the beginning and the ending you are both. When you have shown yourself, you have done your worst and your all; you are your best argument and your sole. Your witness against others is utterly invalidated by your witness against yourself. You leave your sting in the wound; you cannot lay the golden eggs, for you are already dead."

To this information the defendant pleaded that he was "not guilty." He also pleaded a plea of justification, in substance as follows:—

"1. That before the composing and publishing of the said alleged libel, to wit on the 1st of January, 1830, &c., the said G. G. Achilli was an infidel, to wit at Westminster, in the county of Middlesex.

"2. That the said G. G. Achilli was and exercised the functions of a priest of the Church of Rome at Viterbo, Capua, Naples, and elsewhere, and whilst such priest, &c., he secretly abandoned and disbelieved the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, to wit, &c., and though outwardly professing chastity and purity of life, he committed the several acts of fornication, adultery, and impurity hereinafter mentioned, and by reason thereof was a hypocrite.

"3. That the said G. G. Achilli was a profligate under a cowl in that, being a member of the order of St. Dominic or Friars Preachers, and bound by vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, he committed the several acts of fornication and impurity hereinafter mentioned.

"4. That the said G. G. Achilli had a faculty to lecture at Viterbo, of which faculty, as early as 1826, he was for certain misconduct, deprived by the superior of the order, one F. Velzi, but which misconduct was concealed and suppressed by the said superior, and is to the said J. H. Newman unknown.

"5. That the said G. G. Achilli in 1826 was a friar of the order of St. Dominic in the convent of Gradi at Viterbo, and contrary to his duty as such friar, neglected to

attend divine service in the choir, and without the permission of his superior, had frequent intercourse with persons not belonging to the said order, and so in 1827 had already earned the reputation of a scandalous friar.

"6. That the said G. G. Achilli in February 1831, at Viterbo, debauched seduced and carnally knew one Elena Valente then being chaste and unmarried and of the age of 18 years, and then and there robbed her of her honour.

"7. That the said G. G. Achilli, at Viterbo, debauched &c. one Rosa de Allessandris, then being chaste and unmarried, of the age of 28 years, and robbed her of her honour, and on the 1st of Sept. 1833, at Viterbo, was found guilty thereof, upon due inquiry before the bishop of Viterbo.

"8. That the said G. G. Achilli on the 1st of July 1834, at Viterbo, debauched &c. a certain other young woman of the age of 24 years, whose name is to the said J. H. Newman unknown, and then and there robbed the said woman of her honour.

"9. That the said G. G. Achilli, at Viterbo and in the neighbourhood, committed sins similar or worse, and debauched &c. one Vincenza Guerra then being chaste and unmarried, also another woman then being chaste and unmarried, whose name is to the said J. H. Newman unknown, and that the said G. G. Achilli was afterwards at Rome before the Court of the Holy Office, or Inquisition, found guilty of the said several offences.

"10. That the said G. G. Achilli on the 1st of January, 1835, being a friar of the order of Saint Dominic at Capua, debauched &c. a certain other woman being chaste and unmarried whose name is to the said J. H. Newman unknown.

"11. That the said G. G. Achilli on the 1st January 1840, at Naples, debauched &c. one Maria Giovanni Principe, a female child of 15 years of age &c.

"12. That the place where the said G. G. Achilli debauched the said Rosa de Allessandris was the sacristy of the Church of Gradi at Viterbo, and that the day on which he debauched the said female child at Naples was Good Friday in the year 1840.

"13. That the said G. G. Achilli being a priest of the Church of Rome, at Rome, Capua, Naples and Malta, spoke and taught against the truth of divers doctrines of the Catholic faith, to wit, &c., and also against the laws of morality, to wit the moral obligation of chastity and continence, and thereby did pervert one Luigi De Sanctis, one Fortunato Saccares, the said Rosa de Allessandris, the said Elena Valente, and the said Maria Giovanni Principe—from their belief in such doctrines and obedience to such laws.

"14. That on the 2nd of July, 1843, at Corfu, the said G. G. Achilli debauched and made faithless to her husband one Marianna Crisafi the wife of one Nicolo Garamoni, a tailor; and afterwards, on the 1st of August 1843, at Corfu, the said G. G. Achilli publicly cohabited and committed adultery with one Albina the lawful wife of one Vincenzo Coriboni a chorus-singer, and publicly travelled about with her from Corfu to Zante.

"15. That on the 1st of May, 1848, and for 12 months precediug, the said G. G. Achilli held the office of Professor of Theology in a Protestant College, to wit, St. Julian's College, at Malta, and during that period hindered and frustrated an investigation then pending before Messrs. Hadfield and Brien, officers of the college, concerning charges of fornication and other gross immorality against one Fortunato Saccares and one Pietro Leononi, in which charges the said G. G. Achilli was also implicated, by sending away the said Fortunato Saccares to Sicily, and thereupon the Earl of Shaftesbury and others the committee of the said college dismissed the said G. G. Achilli from his said office of professor, and that the said G. G. Achilli was dismissed as well for hindering and frustrating the said investigation as for the said several acts of sin, fornication, and immorality hereinbefore mentioned, but which the said committee were then unwilling to and have still forborne to state and describe, and cannot get themselves to describe specifically.

"16. That the said G. G. Achilli, in the years 1847, 1850, and 1851, being resident in London, did attempt to seduce and debauch one Harriet Harris, then being chaste and unmarried, and did conduct himself lewdly and indecently as well to the said Harriet Harris as to one Jane Legg, one Sarah Wood, one Catherine Gorman, and one Mademoiselle Fortay; and by reason thereof, and of the said several other matters hereinbefore set forth, the said G. G. Achilli was guilty of extraordinary depravity, and was and is the scandal of Catholicism.

"17. That the said G. G. Achilli was a profligate by the commission of the said acts of profligacy, and also had been and was an unbeliever and a hypocrite.

"18. That the said G. G. Achilli, at the Convent of Gradi, at Viterbo, in the year 1836, continually absented himself from the choir of the chancel of the said Convent

during Divine service, and was a frequenter of private houses, contrary to the rules of the said order of St. Dominic, and had thereby given offence to divers lay persons not members of the said order whose names are to the said J. H. Newman unknown.

"19. That, on the 16th day of June, 1841, at Rome by the Court of the Holy Office, or Inquisition, the said G. G. Achilli was suspended from the celebration of mass and disabled from any cure of souls and from preaching and hearing confessions and from exercising the sacerdotal office.

"20. That after the said G. G. Achilli had debauched the said Rosa de Allessandris, at Viterbo of the age of 28 years, on the 1st of September, 1833, he was obliged o give the sum of 50 scudi (£10) to the father of the said young woman as damages, and that by the official reports of the police at Viterbo it is declared that the said G. G. Achilli had given the said money as such hush money to the said father of the said young woman.

"21. That, on the 1st of January 1839, in and by an official document or report of the officers of police at Naples, and being amongst the archives and documents of the said Neapolitan police, the said G. G. Achilli was reported and declared to be known for habitual incontinency at Naples.

"22. That after the said G. G. Achilli had debauched the said Marianna Crisaffi, the wife of the said Nicolo Geramoni, the tailor, on the 3d of July, 1843, the name of the said G. G. Achilli came before the civil tribunal at Corfu in respect of the said crime of adultery, that is to say that Nicolo Geramoni, by Antonio Capello his advocate, presented a petition to the Court praying that a petition presented by his said wife Marianna for alimony should be rejected, upon the ground that the said Marianna had been guilty of adultery with the said G. G. Achilli, and offered to prove the same by lawful witnesses.

"23. That the said G. G. Achilli, on the 1st of January 1850, and on divers other days, though knowing himself to have been guilty of the several offences aforesaid, did deny them all; and that the said G. G. Achilli when he committed the said offences, and thereby was in fact ravening after sin, did profess and pretend to be seeking after truth; and that by reason of the said offences the said G. G. Achilli was and is a proof that priests may fall and friars break their vows; and that by reason of his said offences, the said G. G. Achilli was and is unworthy to be believed in respect of the charges by him made against the doctrines and discipline of the Church of Rome, and the persons professing the same. And so the said J. H. Newman says that the said alleged libel consists of allegations true in substance and in fact, and of fair and reasonable comments thereon.

"And the said J. H. Newman further saith, that at the time of the publishing of the said alleged libel, it was for the public benefit that the matters therein contained should be published, because he says that great excitement prevailed, and numerous public discussions had been held in divers places in England on divers matters of controversy betwen the Churches of England and Rome, with respect to which it was important the truth should be known, and inasmuch as the said G. G. Achilli took a prominent part in such discussions, and his opinion and testimony were by many persons appealed to and relied on as a person of character and respectability—with reference to the matters in controversy, it was necessary, for the purpose of more effectually examining and ascertaining the truth, that the matters in the said alleged libel should be published and known, in order that it might more fully appear that the opinion and testimony of the said G. G. Achilli were not deserving of credit or consideration by reason of his previous misconduct; and also because the said G. G. Achilli had been and was, at Birmingham, Leamington, Brighton, Bath, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Winchester, and elsewhere, endeavouring by preaching and lecturing to excite discord and animosity towards Her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. and against the religion and practice of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion, against the peace of our said Lady the Queen, and it was of importance and conducive to the diminishing of such discord and animosity, and to preserve the peace of our said Lady the Queen, that the said matters should be published and known to all the liege subjects of our said Lady the Queen; and also because the said G. G. Achilli had improperly pretended to such subjects that he was a person innocent of the said crimes and misconduct, and that he was greatly injured by the said foreign ecclesiastical tribunals, and that he had been persecuted and oppressed by the Roman Catholic Church, and by the Bishops and authorities thereof, on account of his religious opinions, and that he was a martyr on account of his religious opinions, and by means of such improper pretences was endeavouring, and was likely to obtain,

credit and support from such subjects, by reason of their being ignorant of the said misconduct of the said G. G. Achilli, it then became and was of public importance and for the public benefit to expose the impropriety and want of truth of such pretences, and to prevent the said subjects being deceived and misled by such pretences, and to have the real character of the said G. G. Achilli and his conduct made known to such subjects and the public in general. And also because many benevolent persons and the public generally were at that time disposed to show kindness and give assistance to the said G. G. Achilli, on the ground of his having been harshly and unjustly treated by the said Court of the Holy Office, or Inquisition, and by the said superior of the said Order of St. Dominic, and on the ground that he was a person deserving of kindness and assistance, and it was for the benefit of the public that the said matters should be published for the purpose of showing that the said G. G. Achilli had been treated fairly and properly, and according to his deserts by the said Court, and the said superior, and that the said G. G. Achilli is a person wholly undeserving of kindness and assistance, and because the said G. G. Achilli had obtained, and was likely again to obtain, preferment and employment of public trust and confidence, which he was unfit to obtain by reason of the said matters, and which he had obtained, and was likely to obtain only by reason of the said matters being unknown and unpublished. And so the said J. H. Newman says he published the said alleged libel, as he lawfully might for the causes aforesaid, and this the said J. H. Newman is ready to verify. Wherefore he prays judgment, &c."

The replication joined issue on the plea of "Not Guilty," and replied *de injuriâ* to the plea of justification, whereupon issue was joined.

When the case was called on nine of the special jury only answered to their names. The prosecutor's counsel then prayed a *tales*, and the jury were sworn.

Mr. T. F. Ellis, the junior counsel for the Crown, having opened the pleadings.

The Attorney-General rose and said—Gentlemen of the jury, this is a criminal information filed against the Rev. Dr. Newman, for a libel contained in a pamphlet published in the month of October, 1851, entitled, "*Lectures on the present Position of Catholics in England*, addressed to the Brothers of the Oratory, by John Henry Newman, D.D., Priest of the Congregation of St. Philip. Lecture V., Logical Inconsistencies of the Protestant View." The prosecutor, Dr. Achilli, is an Italian by birth, and was formerly a monk of the Dominican order and a priest of the Roman Catholic Church. He has since embraced the Protestant faith, and is now the minister of an Italian Protestant church in the neighbourhood of golden-square. The defendant, Dr. Newman, as must be well known to all of you, was formerly a clergyman of our Established Church, and a very distinguished graduate of the University of Oxford. He has since become a convert to the Roman Catholic faith, of which, if he is not the most able, he is at least the most zealous priest. Before the year 1851, Dr. Achilli had paid occasional visits to this country; but having in that year escaped from the prison of the Inquisition, in which he had been confined for six months, he arrived in this country, and has resided here ever since. He is a person of considerable talent, of great self-reliance, of indomitable energy, and I ought perhaps to add that he appears to possess a strong determined will, which occasionally renders him unwilling to submit to authority. Such a person, having revelations to make respecting the dungeons of the Inquisition, in which he had been twice incarcerated, and as to the religious doctrines and practices of the professors of the Roman Catholic religion, was likely to be listened to by the public with great attention. He attended public meetings, where he excited much interest, and the statements there made when published were read with the greatest avidity. It was found that such a man was a most formidable adversary. It was thought to be a most important object, therefore, to impeach his veracity and destroy his credit; and no person appears to have addressed himself to the task with more zeal, if not with more ability, than Dr. Newman. He was aware of the temper of the English people, and he knew that nothing was more likely to scandalize them than if charges of immorality could be fixed upon Dr. Achilli. He therefore raked up all the scandals that the enemies of Dr. Achilli had ever disseminated, and gave them out in his own language to the persons whom he addressed, and then gave them out to the world in the pamphlet which he

afterwards published. It seems that Dr. Newman was engaged, in the year 1851, in giving a course of lectures to the brothers of the Oratory, and the pamphlet in question is the fifth lecture, on the "Logical Inconsistency of the Protestant view." In this pamphlet he undertook to destroy the character of Dr. Achilli, and in page 195, after introducing the subject by referring the reader to the one sided intellect of Protestants, and to the meeting at which Dr. Newman stated the chief minister of the law talked of trampling Cardinal Wiseman's hat in the dirt (the learned Attorney-General here read the extract), he proceeded in the words which formed the subject of the present information. (The learned Attorney-General here read the words of the libel.) If Dr. Newman had confined himself to general charges of profligacy against Dr. Achilli, he would not have felt himself called upon to take any step to vindicate himself; he might have attributed them to mere religious hostility, and would have treated them with silence and contempt. But it was impossible so to deal with charges of this description, so specific and minute, in which, though names were kept back, the dates and places were distinctly stated. It was quite clear that if Dr. Achilli took no notice of these charges—if he had not called on his accuser to justify the statements he had made, the world would fairly and justly have believed that the charges were true, and that it was out of the power of Dr. Achilli to disprove them. Dr. Achilli was therefore bound to apply to the law to vindicate his character, and therefore he applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a criminal information. Before he could obtain the sanction of the Court to file this information, it was absolutely necessary that he should upon his oath give a distinct and specific denial of every one of the charges which had been brought against him. He has done so, and the information was granted, and Dr. Newman has now pleaded to that information. Until recently this anomaly existed in our law in relation to proceedings upon libels:—If the party libelled proceeded by action, it was competent to the party against whom he proceeded to plead that the libel was true, and if he succeeded in establishing that the facts charged were true, the party failed in his action. But if the party proceeded by indictment or information for the same libel, it was not open to the party against whom he proceeded to plead the truth of the charges; for such proceedings being upon the ground that the publication of a libel tended to produce a breach of the peace, it was manifest that that would be likely to result whether the libel was true or false. This gave rise to the common saying, "The greater the truth, the greater the libel." This absurdity in the law had been removed by a law introduced by the noble and learned Lord who presides on the present occasion, so that now a party is able to plead the truth of the libel, adding that the publication is for the public benefit. Dr. Newman has now availed himself of this privilege, and has pleaded a plea of justification, which contains 23 distinct charges; he has introduced the particulars of different charges, and has undertaken to prove the truth of these statements in his plea. As the plea follows the statements in the libel, it involves charges of the most serious description against the moral character of Dr. Achilli. The earliest period to which they refer is the year 1826, so that you have now to investigate the life, character, and conduct of Dr. Achilli for a period of 26 years. The plea states that in the year 1831 Dr. Achilli seduced several women, some of whom are named, and some of whom are stated to be unknown. One of these crimes, it is stated, was committed in the sacristy of a church, and another committed on a child of 15 years of age on a Good Friday. He is accused of adultery with two persons, who are named, and with being dismissed from his office in the college at Malta, for hindering and stifling an investigation into acts of fornication and impropriety in which he was himself implicated. In the years 1847, 1850, and 1851, Dr. Achilli was in this country, and similar offences are charged against him during those periods; and the whole is summed up by the statement that in the archives of the police at Naples there are reports that Dr. Achilli was known for habitual incontinence. The learned Attorney-General then proceeded to observe that he had felt somewhat embarrassed as to the course which he ought to pursue in this investigation. Under ordinary circumstances (he said) I should be desirous of anticipating all the

charges in the plea, and rebutting them before-hand; but it appears to me and my learned friends that it would be impossible to adopt that course upon the present occasion. If the charges be true, it is manifest that, from the situation of the parties, greater facilities would be afforded to Dr. Newman in Italy for substantiating those charges; and if untrue, Dr. Newman would have better opportunities of bringing witnesses from that source. We are here in utter uncertainty as to the mode in which Dr. Newman proposes to substantiate these charges. We are aware of some of the witnesses who are here, and we are prepared to rebut their testimony; but we are unaware as to how the majority of the charges are to be proved. We are, therefore, obliged to wait till the defendant's witnesses have been called, and then to call our witnesses. I pledge myself, however, among others to call Dr. Achilli himself at the proper time, and to submit him to the searching cross-examination of my learned friend on the other side. To Dr. Achilli this is a question of the deepest anxiety and importance. He is here to answer for his conduct during the last 26 years of his existence. He calmly, and I may add fearlessly, awaits the result of this investigation. He is aware of all the difficulties with which he is surrounded. He knows that nothing but the most careful attention will enable us to ascertain the credit due to the witnesses who will be called; but he is satisfied, that though he is a foreigner—I had almost said because he is a foreigner—that impartiality which invariably distinguishes a British jury will be extended to him on this occasion, and that you will join with those to whom his vital interests are intrusted in the discovery of that truth upon which he will stand or fall on this his day of trial.

The following evidence was then given:—

John Cadell Worman, examined by the Solicitor-General.—I am clerk to the prosecutor's attorney. I produce a rule of court.

Mr. Serjeant Wilkins requested all the witnesses might be sent out of court.

Lord Campbell said all the witnesses must be sent out of court.

The Attorney-General said it was of the greatest importance to Dr. Achilli that he should be allowed to remain.

Mr. Serjeant Wilkins insisted that Dr. Achilli should not be allowed to remain.

Lord Campbell said, as it was insisted on, Dr. Achilli must leave.

The rule of court for the criminal information was then read.

A Juryman here observed that it was rather unfair to Dr. Achilli that he should be removed from court.

Lord Campbell said, as the defendant insisted upon his leaving, it must be so.

Proof was then given of the publication of the libel, which was taken as read.

This was the case for the Crown.

Sir. A. E. Cockburn then rose and said—Gentlemen of the jury, in rising to address you on behalf of the defendant, Dr. Newman, it would be vain for me to disguise from myself that I have undertaken to perform a task which is calculated to inspire considerable apprehension. When I consider that the question involves religious considerations, it requires no more to make me sensible of the difficulties I shall have to encounter in obtaining, even from men of your honour, that fair and impartial hearing which is essential in order that the defendant may obtain justice at your hands. I have not performed my part in the administration of justice for so many years without having been painfully impressed, even under the purest forms in which justice is administered in this country, which are our boast, how difficult it is, when political or class interests intervene, to keep our minds free from prejudice. Still more difficult is it, when religious considerations are involved, for even the best and worthiest of men to protect themselves from that bias on questions of this description which is calculated to steel the heart and pervert our judgment, without our being sensible of the influence which is exercised over us. And in what case would there be more reason to apprehend the existence of such bias than in the case now before you? Unhappily, it has been reserved for our days, after many generations, to see the flame of religious controversy between opposing Churches again enkindled. Woe to our times that such should be so; but this is not under our control. We have now two great champions of these contending

Churches before us; and I ask any man to commune with his own heart and ask himself are we not all prone to look on those whose opinions agree with our own as champions of the faith? Do we not look on them with a partial eye, and look with distrust on those who differ from us? If a man has been converted from the Roman Catholic to the Protestant faith, do we not look upon it as the effect of reason, and the light of truth and sincere conviction? And if a doubt is thrown upon his motives, our feelings rise against it, and we become the advocates of that man's cause. But take the case of one who has seceded from our Church; he is called a deserter and an apostate; and how prone we are to attribute his conversion to the basest and most sordid motives by which the heart can be influenced! These are the two cases which are now before us. The parties are two converts or apostates from the faith in which they had been brought up; and they have become the champions of the faith which they have espoused. And on behalf of one of these I have to defend his cause before a jury consisting, perhaps, without a single exception, of those whose faith he has abandoned. I trust, however, that before God and man you will discharge your duty; and if I feel any distrust at all, it is only because of—I had almost said the impossibility that you should discharge it. I call upon you, in the name of all that is sacred, to guard against prejudice or passion, and to come to the investigation with calm and unprejudiced minds. Consider in what condition Dr. Newman stands in this case. He is bound to substantiate these charges, I admit. He has made them from no private or personal motives; he has no spite or vindictive feeling for making the attack. My learned friend (the Attorney-General) has suggested to you the cause. He says Dr. Achilli came forward to reveal the secrets of the dungeons of the Inquisition, and to expose the evil practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and therefore it was necessary that he should be put down, and put to open shame; and, therefore, he says, Dr. Newman, as champion of the Roman Catholic Church, raked up all the slander which the enemies of Dr. Achilli had circulated against him, and put it into one libel, and published it to the world to destroy the character and conduct of Dr. Achilli. There was one thing, however, which my learned friend knew, and which, I think, he ought to have told you, and that is, that this libel was not published by Dr. Newman in the first instance, but every one of these charges had been published openly to the world for 15 months before Dr. Achilli took them up. They were published with far more particularity both as to time and place, and they were brought to Dr. Achilli's notice, as appears by his book in which he refers to them. For 15 months he remained perfectly silent; he had not the courage or the boldness to answer the charges, but at last he came forward and obtained this information against Dr. Newman. I do not say that this is a justification in point of law; but in fairness to Dr. Newman it ought to be brought forward, because it shows that he was not the inventor of the charges, and that his (Dr. Achilli's) silence might have induced the inference, and been a tacit acknowledgment that they were true What, then, are the real motives which influenced Dr. Newman in his attack on Dr. Achilli? Dr. Achilli quitted the Roman Catholic Church, in which he had been a priest and a monk. He came forward in 1844 and 1845, and said he was a convert to Protestantism, that he could no longer endure the abominations of the Roman Catholic Church. His language against the Church of Rome was of the strongest kind. He denounced the corruptions of the clergy, and the dissoluteness of their lives. In the year 1844 he addressed one who had been his benefactor and his friend, the supreme head of the Church which he had quitted, Pope Gregory XVI., in these terms. The passage was at page 376 of Dr. Achilli's book, entitled *Dealings with the Inquisition*:—

"Yes, the people, deceived by you, have good reason no longer to believe you. You have deceived them with your doctrines—your own, not those of the Gospel—invented for your own profit alone, not for the benefit of men's souls, to which you have even denied consolation when they could not give you silver and gold in payment for it. You deceive them with your practices, when you, so avaricious, preach disinterestedness; you, so impure, chastity; you, so vindictive, forgiveness; you, so

insubordinate, submission; you, so turbulent, peace; you, so self-indulgent, temperance; you, so indolent, industry; you, so immoral, holiness. . Thus, to this day, you have deceived the people, and they have ceased to believe in you, perceiving that God did not dwell in you—that God no longer spoke through your untruthful lips."

If that was the way in which he addressed the head of the Church, it might easily be imagined how he would address the inferior clergy. He accused them of licentiousness and wickedness of the most abominable kind. Now, if these charges were true, there can be no doubt that it was important for mankind that it should be known. How, then, are we to ascertain the truth? Is the Roman Catholic, who believes his to be the true Church, to remain silent? When accusations such as these are fulminated against the Roman Catholic Church before the world, was it not the duty of Roman Catholics to come forward and vindicate the character of their Church? It would be a farce to talk of toleration if you were to hear only the attacks made by adversaries, and not to allow them to raise their voice in its defence. Dr. Newman came forward to vindicate the religion which he had adopted against a man who said the Church of Rome, like Sodom and Gomorrah, cried to Heaven for vengeance, and that it was the duty of all good men to sweep it from the face of the earth. When these things were said in sermons and in books, can you hesitate to say that it was the duty of Roman Catholics to make the best defence they could? Dr. Achilli dealt in vague and general charges; he did not condescend to specify particular facts; but yet these charges were important as coming from a man who came forward and said he was a living witness of what he stated. The question then arose, Who is this man who now comes forward to denounce the Church from which he is an apostate? When a witness comes forward in a court of justice, the first question asked is, who and what is the witness? whence comes he, and what are his antecedents? what are his motives? "Who, and what are you, Dr. Achilli, who tell us these astounding facts?" He says, "I am one upon whom these facts have made so deep an impression that I revolted against their doctrines and their hideous impurities." If it be true that such are the abominations of the Roman Catholic system, that Dr. Achilli, with a prospect of honour and preferment, abandoned all from a sense, not only of the incorrectness of the Roman Catholic doctrines, but from disgust and abhorrence of the practices of the Roman Catholic clergy, I admit that that testimony must produce an effect upon those who might be wavering in their opinions, and still more upon those who believe that Protestantism is more correct in the sight of God, and who take an unfavourable view of the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church. But if it should turn out that instead of being a voluntary deserter from the faith in which he was born and bred, he had been expelled for his crimes—if he adopted Protestantism from the exigency of the moment, when he was expelled from the Church which had abandoned him, this would be an important element in judging of his testimony, and would utterly destroy the effect of his evidence, if true. Suppose his expulsion from the Church of Rome was not brought about by his apostacy from its doctrines, but by his own confession of crimes which would be bad in any one, but were detestable in one who had become a member of the sacerdotal calling of a Christian minister, was it not the duty of Dr. Newman to bring these facts before the world? That is Dr. Newman's case. Dr. Achilli had denounced the Church of Rome in the language I have described. In June, 1850, was published in the *Dublin Review* the whole account of Dr. Achilli's life, giving the times and circumstances, and challenging him to an inquiry, and stating that documents and living testimony would be produced. For 15 months he left those charges unanswered, and almost unnoticed. In 1850, when he published his book entitled *Dealings with the Inquisition*, he contented himself with a general denial of them, and took no steps to institute proceedings. The author of that libel, Cardinal Wiseman (according to Dr. Achilli's statement), was not a person beneath his notice. Dr. Achilli, in page 76 of his book entitled *Dealings with the Inquisition*, thus noticed the article in the *Dublin Review*:—"There is the renowned Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, according to the Pope's creation, the same

who had the assurance to censure me from his pulpit, and to publish an infamous article in the *Dublin Review*, in which he has raked together, as in a dunghill, every species of filth from the sons of Ignatius Loyola, nor is there lie or calumny that he has not made use of against me." This article was written before Dr. Newman's, viz., in June, 1850, but no other notice was taken of it; though the learned Attorney-General now says, that when Dr. Newman published his pamphlet it was incumbent upon Dr. Achilli to compel him to prove his charges. Dr. Newman now reiterates those charges, for which he is responsible, and the question now is, whether he is able to justify them. Inquiries were made about Dr. Achilli, and the result is, that Dr. Newman is prepared to vindicate the truth of the charges which he published. My learned friend (the Attorney-General) has pursued a course in this case which has astonished me. Dr. Achilli knows every charge against him, the time and place, the person, and every particular. He is now in the precincts of the court, and my learned friend might have put him into the witness-box, indeed I should have expected that he (Dr. Achilli) would rush into the witness-box, in order that he might deny upon oath these charges. But that course is not convenient; it is thought better to see what can be made out, whether the witnesses will break down, whether documents can be excluded, so that Dr. Achilli may not be called.

The Attorney-General here observed that he had pledged himself to call Dr. Achilli. (Sir A. E. Cockburn had been out of court when this pledge was given.)

Lord Campbell said he thought the proper course had been pursued.

Sir. A. E. Cockburn continued.—Upon that intimation from his Lordship he would admit that that was the correct course, and would at once pass to state the truth of the case. Dr. Achilli was about 50 years of age, and was a native of Viterbo, in the Roman States. In the year 1819, being sixteen years of age, he entered as a novice the Dominican convent at Viterbo. After one year, at the end of his noviciate, he became a monk of the Dominican order, and in the ensuing year a priest of the Roman Catholic Church. In one of those capacities, if not in both, he took a vow of perpetual chastity. No one can doubt that, however loose may be the practice of society in general, in the case of a priest continence is of the utmost importance, and more especially when solemn and holy vows are taken. I fully admit that in the case of a monk a charge of fornication is one of the most serious character. On the other hand, such charges are matters of grave and serious moment if they turn out to be true in the case of a man who is denouncing those very serious crimes against the Roman Catholic Church. Dr. Achilli became a priest in the year 1825, and in 1826 he was appointed Professor of Philosophy at the seminary or college at Viterbo, and remained at Viterbo, with occasional absence, till the year 1833. The libel charges that during that time he was guilty of various acts of incontinence at Viterbo. It says, "I am that Achilli who, in the diocese of Viterbo, in February, 1831, robbed of her honour a young woman of 18." Is that true or false? It might be said that if at an early period of life, when his blood was hot, he committed an offence of that kind, but had atoned for it by a life of purity and holiness, it would be cruelty to fling the charge in the face of a man who now came forward to reprove those crimes. I concur in that view; but this is only the commencement of the history, which will be brought down year by year to the present time. In February, 1831, he robbed of her honour a young woman of 18. I will produce that young woman before you. Her name was Elena Valente. She is now, and has been for some years, a married woman. She had on former occasions denounced him as the author of her ruin, and she will repeat it here to-day. Dr. Newman was not the author of this story, but it was made the subject of investigation, and punishment was awarded to Dr. Achilli upon its account. You will hear from her how he pursued her from time to time and endeavoured to seduce her, and at last succeeded. She thus became disgraced for years, till by a course of good conduct her character was retrieved. The libel charges that in the year 1833, Dr. Achilli committed another such crime; that was the case of Rosa Allessandris; and another in July, 1834. For these crimes he was tried; he confessed them, and was punished. The libel charges that "in the year 1826

I was deprived of my faculty to lecture for an offence which my superiors did their best to conceal." In that it appeared to be some mistake as to the date; but the fact was that he was so deprived. It says, "and who in 1827 had already acquired the reputation of a scandalous friar." That I shall prove. He remained at Viterbo till the year 1833, when some proceedings were instituted against him in the Court of the Bishop for acts of incontinency, and he went to Rome. He had strong friends at Rome, the matter was hushed up, and he became professor at the Minerva College, at Rome. He remained there a year, and then proceeded to Capua, at the invitation of Cardinal Selva, who invited him to go and preach the Lent sermons at Capua. There could be no doubt, that he was then, as he is now, celebrated for his talent in preaching. In the year 1835 he went to Capua, and passed his time for two or three years between Capua and Naples. There were yet two more of these cases, which form the subject of this libel. "I am that son of St. Dominic who is known to have repeated the offence at Capua in 1834 and 1835, and at Naples—again, in 1840, in the case of a child of fifteen." By his own confession he admitted that he committed these offences. The name of the girl was Maria Giovanni Principe, now married to a person named Belisario. I shall prove to you that upon this girl he made several attempts, that he got her in a room of the chapel of a convent, that he got her with child, and that he was obliged to make compensation to the father. The girl is married now, and is a respectable woman. Her mother accompanies her here; you will hear her evidence, and see whether she is worthy of credit. This charge is not made now for the first time, but was proved before the Ecclesiastical Court, and was known to Dr. Achilli himself. It seems that in the year 1839 he separated from the Dominican order, to which he had been up to that time attached. Whether the separation was complete there might be some doubt, but he secularized, as he thought. He went on preaching in Capua, but such was the scandal at Naples and Capua from these acts that it was necessary to bring these things before the Superior Court, and he was sentenced to three years' suspension from his functions, and seclusion in one of the more rigorous religious houses. This did not suit Dr. Achilli, and he began to meditate secession. The fame of these proceedings came to the ears even of the Court of Rome. He was demanded from Naples, and brought before the Court of the Inquisition, and charged with all these scandals. I have the record of the proceedings here—not, indeed, the original record, but an authenticated copy. It contains the confession of Dr. Achilli himself, who was sentenced by the Ecclesiastical Court of the Inquisition to perpetual deprivation from his ecclesiastical functions, from hearing confessions, &c., and to three years' seclusion in one of the more rigorous religious houses. He retired to the Convent of Nizarro, where three years were to be passed in doing penance. But this did not suit him. In his book he said he went to Nizarro to arrange his private affairs. He did not stay at Nizarro, but went off in haste to Ancona, and meeting with a gentleman, he got his name inserted in his passport, and went with him to Corfu, which is in the dominions of this country. He now openly secedes from the Roman Catholic religion, and professes to have adopted the pure truth of Protestantism. At Corfu he opened what he called an Italian Church, but there he soon got into a scrape, "and made the wife of a tailor faithless to her husband." The tailor had separated from his wife and had been adjudged to allow her 2s. a week as alimony. But he distrusted the fidelity of his wife, and watched her house at night with the view of clearing up his suspicions, and one night, at half-past 11 o'clock, he saw a person come there, not in the dress of a priest, but in an ordinary dress. He seized hold of the party, and holding up a light, he found that it was Dr. Achilli. The tailor then appealed to the Court, but the affair was compromised, and it was agreed that the husband should pay no more money, and that the wife should be relieved from the charge. We had this man here, but he was obliged to leave England, but we have a man who saw the whole of the transaction, and he will prove that Dr. Achilli was that man. I have also the transcript of the proceedings, which will establish the assertion made in the libel, that "your name came before the Civil Court of Corfu for your crime of adultery." After this scandal he went to Zante.

At that time he made the acquaintance of a chorus-singer named Coriboni. The wife of this man was a woman of notoriously bad character, and combined prostitution as a means of getting money with the profession which her husband carried on. Dr. Achilli took these people into his suite, and travelled with them to Zante, where he was desirous of establishing this reformed Italian Church under that mission which he boasts in his book of having received from Heaven. He there applied to a gentleman named Reynolds, who held an office of respectability and trust in the Customs. Mr. Reynolds was disposed to further the object, and became a subscriber. Dr. Achilli obtained subscriptions, interested the Vice-Governor of the island, Colonel Ford, and having obtained considerable subscriptions, the church was opened. Mr. Reynolds happened to know something of this Madame Coriboni. Her character was open and notorious, and yet, to Mr. Reynolds's astonishment, when he went to the church, he found the wife officiating as pew-opener, and the husband as clerk. He thereupon remonstrated with Dr. Achilli (I have Mr. Reynolds here, and will put him in the box), upon which Dr. Achilli assured him that the woman was a second Magdalen, and intended to lead a pure and virtuous life. Mr. Reynolds hardly knew what to make of this; but it so happened that his house was opposite Dr. Achilli's, where there was a laundry in which the woman worked. He thus had an opportunity of seeing Dr. Achilli toying with this Magdalen in a way not at all satisfactory in a minister of religion. This happened more than once, and there was always that degree of familiarity between the parties which naturally led to unfavourable conclusions. From what was seen going on between Dr. Achilli and this woman it became necessary to close the blinds of this and the adjoining houses, the ladies in which were much scandalized. Dr. Achilli was seen walking arm-in-arm with this lady, and sitting at table with her, and no doubt was left that a criminal intercourse subsisted between them. Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Ford remonstrated, but as Dr. Achilli persisted in keeping her in his house, they would have no more to do with him, and the congregation was broken up. Dr. Achilli then went to Malta, and came to England. At that time an attempt was being made to establish a college at Malta. A body of gentlemen, at the head of whom was the Earl of Shaftesbury (a nobleman who was at the head of every benevolent undertaking which was calculated to promote the moral, social, and religious welfare of mankind), were endeavouring to establish a college there for general instruction, and it was arranged that Dr. Achilli should be the theological professor at the college. He goes to Malta, where he is associated with others, two of whom were priests, named Saccares and Leonini, who had been somewhat too hastily adopted at this college. A person named Kaossi, who had been an Armenian priest, and fled from the Roman Catholic authorities, was a member of the college, and he had not been long there before he made charges against his fellow-labourers, involving Dr. Achilli, as well as Saccares and Leonini. Dr. Achilli was only so far connected with them that he was said to have connived at their conduct. These charges were by Messrs. Hadfield and Watt transmitted to London; and as Saccares and Leonini, as well as Dr. Achilli, denied the charges, the committee said that Kaossi should be called upon to prove his charge. The charge consisted of a confession, which Saccares and Leonini denied altogether. The consequence was that Kaossi was looked upon as an inventor, and was about to be dismissed, when numerous persons came forward and gave a different account of the affair, which led the Messrs. Hadfield and Watt to appoint a day to resume the inquiry. All this was known to Dr. Achilli, who knew that the board in London wanted inquiry into the charge which related to introducing women into the college. But, to the astonishment of all, Dr. Achilli took upon himself, without communicating with the authorities at Malta or London, to send Saccares into Sicily to distribute bibles there. This was a mere pretext to get rid of him. This put an end to Saccares' connexion with the college, and the board in London dismissed Dr. Achilli from his office for having, in defiance of propriety, sent Saccares away. This committee, consisting of gentlemen of the highest respectability, the Earl of Waldgrave, the Rev. R. Burgess, and others, dismissed him after investigating the matter. Dr. Achilli, in 1850, came to Eng-

land, when he began that course of lecturing and writing, and holding up to hatred and disgust the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, which he has since pursued. In the year 1849, being at Rome, during the time of the Revolution, a time when anarchy prevailed, he there married a lady named Heley, according to the rites of the new Roman Catholic Church. Whether or not that was consistent with his vows of perpetual chastity was a question for himself. At the first house in which he lived in London there was a maid servant named Harriet Harris. He made use of every effort to seduce that young woman when she brought him up water, and tried again the next day. Mrs. Achilli then arrived in London, and he desisted from his attempts. Though not successful with her (Harris), he was successful with another, named Jane Legg. He took a house at No. 11, Shaftesbury-terrace, Pimlico. Jane Legg was there, she yielded to his solicitations, and became with child. But I believe not only Dr. Achilli, but a friend of his also, who was there, had connexion with her. She went away, and had a child, who died of the small-pox, and it appeared that though Dr. Achilli never did anything for her, he never denied that he had had to do with her. He had another servant, Sarah Wood, whose reluctance and resistance he overcame; and another, named Catherine Gorman, with whom he did not succeed. If these witnesses are to be believed when you see them in the box—if when a married man and removed from those demoralizing examples which he witnessed when in the convents of the Dominican order—having left that polluted atmosphere for the purer atmosphere of the Protestant Church—if having allied himself in what he believed to be a matrimonial alliance with a young lady who devoted herself to him, he endeavoured to make every woman the instrument of his lust, that will throw some light upon his conduct, and will, I think, lead you to believe that these charges are well founded. And if these things be so, I ask whether those whose Church is denounced by such a man are not justified in holding them up to the people of this realm, who are to judge of the truth of his representations in order that they may judge of the credit to be attached to the evidence of such a witness?—that they may judge whether the Catholic Church is that foul nest of pollution and crime, or whether these things are not published by him in order to conceal the reasons and the fact of how he ceased to be a member of that Church? Having been brought to justice and exposed to penance and contrition, he takes care not to bring forward this in his narrative, for if he did he knew that no credit would be attached to statements coming from so foul a source. Whatever may be the zeal of the Protestant Church (and I rejoice to see it burn brightly when occasion requires), I trust it will never lead us to be guilty of denying to others the free, full, and unfettered exercise of their religion, or the free expression of their opinions, or to prevent them from confuting malignant and wicked accusations. [The proceedings of the Court were here interrupted by the shrieks of a gentleman in the gallery who was taken in a fit.] It was under such views alone Dr. Newman had come forward, feeling that he was justified in ascertaining who and what Dr. Achilli was, and, if he had been guilty of improper conduct, to show him in his true colours. I say that the cause of truth demands that in these matters of religious opinion and controversy—matters in which all mankind are deeply interested—truth should be on both sides adhered to, that evidence should be sifted, and when it rests on the character of the witness that that character should be sifted and judged of by those who are interested. On the other hand, I admit that when, with a view to silence an adverse witness, falsehoods and crimes are charged which are known to be untrue, that is a case in which reproof cannot be too severely heaped. As to this case, you will see that Dr. Newman has not invented them. As to all that is substantial I shall make out these charges, and then it will be for Dr. Achilli to see what answer he will make. I should certainly have liked to have heard in the first instance what he would say. Dr. Newman will be upheld by the conviction that he has not acted from any vindictive motive towards Dr. Achilli, but to repel the foul accusations which had been brought forward against the Church of which he is a member. I shall have another opportunity of addressing to you a few words, but I trust that you will now for-

get, for the moment, whatever religious opinions you may entertain on the one side or on the other; look on this case as one indifferent; let not prejudice or passion mingle with your judgment; bringing calm and dispassionate attention to the witnesses; and if you should be of opinion that Dr. Achilli is not guilty, Dr. Newman will submit to your verdict against him; but if you believe the witnesses, and are satisfied by the documents that Dr. Achilli is an impostor, and that the charges which he has brought against the Roman Catholic Church are unfounded and calumnious, do justice to these parties, and enforce it by your verdict.

The following witnesses were then called by the defendant:—

Eleana Giustini an Italian woman, married, and about 40 years of age, was the first witness called. She was examined by Mr. Bramwell, and gave her evidence in a very clear and intelligent manner, without any appearance of hesitation. She answers to the description of a respectable poor person in this country, and though sufficiently plain-looking now, was probably a comely girl at the time to which her testimony chiefly referred. Her evidence was given in Italian, and translated to the Court and jury by interpreters engaged on behalf of either party. She said—My husband's name is Vincenzo Giustini, and I was married two years ago; my maiden name is Valente, and I have lived all my life at Viterbo. I know the Dominican Convent there, and remember Dr. Achilli, who was one of the monks. I went to the convent, when he called me, about 23 years ago, more or less. I was then about 17 or 18.

Mr. Bramwell.—Did anything happen between Dr Achilli and yourself?

Witness.—That for which he sent for me. He deflowered me. I was a virgin at the time. It took place in a part of the sacristy. I had been alone with Dr. Achilli in other places before while in the service of Signora Gentili, with whom Dr. Achilli was acquainted. She resided in a country-house near Viterbo, and Dr. Achilli had been there on a visit during the month of October. He had taken liberties with me previously when I walked out with him alone at his invitation. It is the custom in Italy when any one is in service for visitors to give a present, and Dr. Achilli called me to the convent for that purpose. That was the first occasion on which he had criminal intercourse with me. I consented to what took place for I was there alone and was obliged. (Sensation.) The act took place again some time after, and was continued in the convent, and twice besides in a house in Viterbo. I spoke to him on the sin of it.

Mr. Bramwell.—What did he say?

Witness.—That there was no sin. I told him that it was a hellish matter, but he said, not at all; otherwise hell would be quite full. (Loud laughter.)

Cross-examied by the Attorney General. I arrived in London on Thursday last, and left Viterbo six months ago, on the 23rd of this month. In the interval I have been at Paris, Dover, and some other place between Dover and this. A lady named Signora Rosina de Berna was with me and my husband. I can't say what street I lived in at Paris, but I was there for three months, after which I came to Dover—I think in May. I lived in Dover close to the sea; I can't give the address, but the lady who was with me knows all about it. There were other witnesses in the cause in Paris and at Dover besides myself. Two of them accompanied me from Paris, Joanna Principe and her mother. They lived in the same house with me at both places. I had my instructions from a lawyer whose name I know not, to come over here, and I had the approval of my curate before I left.

The Attorney-General.—Did you ask his leave to come?

Witness.—He told me I ought to come here. His name his Dr. Giuseppe Ramazzi. I talked with the other witnesses in Paris. I told them what had happened to me, and they told me what had happened to them. (Laughter.) I did not know them previously. I have seen other witnesses beside those in London, but not in Paris or Dover. One was an English gentleman, named Reynolds. I have not talked with any priest since my arrival in London. I had only known Dr. Achilli a month before he seduced me, and he was then called Father Achilli. Signora Gentili's villa was about two miles from the convent, and Father Achilli went there to remain a month as a visitor.

There were two other members of the family, both men, and I was the only maid. Not more than five or six days elapsed before he began to take liberties with me. The villa was in a retired situation, and when he first walked out with me he solicited my chastity. He took me to show me bird shooting at a place where two members of the family were. This I did not see, for I did not reach the spot. He took me to a hut which was not occupied, but there was a shepherd passing near with his flock. I went in with Dr. Achilli, who told me that that was the shooting place, and he then solicited my chastity, which I denied him, absolutely believing it to be a sin. I returned home in his company, and said nothing about what had happened to Signora Gentili, but I told it to my confessor when I went to confession some five or six days after. He was not a Dominican, but a priest of the district called Farini. I did not walk again with Father Achilli in the country, but during his stay he repeated his solicitations in the house of my mistress. He told me one night not to go to bed but wait for him and he would come to see me.

The Attorney-General.—Why did he say so?

Witness.—Because he said he had to get by heart a panegyric to St. Cecilia which he had to deliver some days after. I went to bed, and he came and knocked at the door, which I had locked but I did not answer. He knocked gently. My room was far away from Signora Gentili's which was near that of Dr. Achilli. I said nothing to her in the morning, but showed myself disturbed and wishful to leave the place. The Signora did not ask me any questions, and I gave her no reason for leaving, as I had only taken the situation for a month. Dr. Achilli had left for his convent before me. My father and mother were living at the time in Viterbo, and I went home to them, but I did not mention the subject to them. The affair of the convent happened some time in November, but I do not remember the day, and I had not seen Dr. Achilli after my return till then. It took place about 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning, and he was waiting for me in the sacristy, which is off the chapel when I arrived. I saw him beckoning to me with his hand. [The witness pointed out the relative positions of the sacristy and the chapel, and showed the way in which the father beckoned.] I suppose it was more convenient for him to have me in the sacristy. It is an open room, where the monks put on their vestments.

The Attorney-General.—Did he use force?

Witness.—No. He led me into another room by some stairs. He took an inkstand and a sheet of paper with him, and said "Come up," whereupon I followed. When I arrived in the room I ceased to observe objects. I was frightened and did not know what was to be done to me, but I did not lose my senses. I could not now tell all the particulars, for it is so many years ago, but all I know is that at that moment he dishonoured me. I resisted, but do not remember if I cried. I was, however, in a perspiration. After the act he sent me away.

The Attorney-General.—Did he give you any presents?

Witness (sharply).—He gave me a silk handkerchief, which was older than himself. (Great laughter.) I went home, and the next day went to confession to the same confessor to whom I confessed before. I began to cry, and he then told me, "I knew you were in the hands of a rapacious wolf in sheep's clothing." (Sensation.)

The Atorney-General.—Did you say anything to your mother?

Witness.—No; because the confessor prohibited me from saying anything to anybody, on account of Achilli being an ecclesiastic. (Sensation.) I showed the handkerchief to my confessor. The second time the act did not take place in the convent. There were living in Viterbo relations of Dr. Achilli, and he sent for me there.

The Attorney-General—How came you to go to him again after this treatment?

Witness (with much animation).—I felt I was dishonoured, therefore I went. It is very well known that a little affection springs out of such an event. I became so fond of him that I regretted very much his going away from the place. I do not know the house, but he took me into a room, where the act again occurred. He was seated when I went in, and he made me sit also. What occurred after who can recollect? it is so long since. I must have remained about an hour. The next time it happened was in the convent. I ceased to go

to the old confessor after that, and did not go so often to confession. When I confessed, however, I said all, for I could not conceal my sin. I cannot tell the name of the second confessor; he is probably dead, as the first is, I did not mention the name of Dr. Achilli, for the custom is to mention the sin, and not the sinner. (Sensation.)

The Attorney-General.—How came you to mention the name of the sinner to the first confessor, then?

Witness.—Because the first was living near the villa, and might suspect some of the family, and I therefore chose to tell the real author of it. Dr. Achilli had told me, "When you can come to see me," and when I could I did. The second time the act was committed in the convent was in the same place as the first. If force was used on that occasion, I suppose it was on his side, for it is not permitted to the woman to say, "Here I am." A girl as I was I could not ask him. In confessing myself I said that I had sinned with an ecclesiastic in the chapel. It may have occurred more than four times. The second time I went to the house of his relatives it was because he sent for me.

The Attorney-General.—Did he use force on that occasion?

Witness.—The first time he forced me, but after that he used the caresses which are usual towards women. (Laughter.)

The Attorney-General.—Did he give you any other presents besides the silk handkerchiefs?

Witness.—Yes, and beautiful presents they were—three sausages! (Great laughter.) The sausages were given at the same time as the handkerchief. (Continued laughter.)

The Attorney-General.—Did he ever give you any other presents?

Witness.—He often promised, but did not perform. He said he would give me an umbrella, but he has never done so. (Laughter.) I never said a word about it to my mother. I have never mentioned it to anybody except my confessors, but once Salvatori Larosi, a chemist, asked me, "Is it true that Father Achilli has deflowered you?" I answered, "Who told you that?" and he said, "himself." The chemist said so, as far as I could judge, because he wanted to arrive at the same end. This was many years ago, and he is now dead. Dr. Achilli did not remain long at Viterbo after; perhaps about a year. My mother has only lately been informed of the fact; and then I did not tell her anything beyond that I was coming here on a trial.

Being pressed on this point, the witness said sharply, "You would not have me publish my own crime."

The Attorney-General.—Who gave you money to come over here?

Witness.—No one has given me money. I have been found in everything necessary by Signora Rosina Gentili, for I had nothing myself. That lady is a Catholic.

Re-examined by Mr. Bramwell.—My curate was the first who spoke to me on the subject of this case. He sent for me and asked me if I knew anything of Dr. Achilli. I answered, "Why do you ask me?" and he replied, "Never mind." I then said, "Never mind! but what for? Is it for my own good?" He said, "It is for the honour of the Holy Mother Church—for the honour of God." I then said, "If you will come to the confessional, I will tell you," but he would not. He said that to the confessional he could not come, but I was to speak there and then without shame. I then began to say something, and he said, It does not belong to me; you must come to the Vicar-General. An intimation came to me accordingly, and I saw the Vicar-General with a Dominican monk from Rome and another monk belonging to the Convent of St. Filippo, of Viterbo. They told me I must go to Rome, and I went. I saw there an English lawyer who could not speak Italian, and I made no statement before him, but I did before the Vicar-General, and I told him all that I am saying now. I have not seen Dr. Achilli since he left Viterbo. He never said to me, "Good bye," or even as much as "Go to the devil" (laughter), and I knew nothing of it till he was gone. I have been in a convent of nuns for three years, and went to try whether I had a vocation for the life or not—whether the Lord called me to it. Finding that I had no "call," I came away. Of my own

will I did not go, but from the strong advice of my confessor, who seeing there was some danger of my becoming a disreputable woman, induced me to go to the monastery. (Sensation.)

The Rev. Mr. Grotte, a Roman Catholic priest, residing at Broadway, in Worcestershire, was the next witness called.—He spoke English well, and, in answer to questions put by Mr. Addison, said, I am thirty-two years of age, and was educated at the Lyceum College of Viterbo, of which town I am a native. I remember being a student there in the Latin Grammar, and was about eleven years old when Dr. Achilli was professor of Philosophy in the college, being also a priest in holy orders and a Dominican monk. His reputation at that time was very bad, but I do not know why. There is a Bishops' Court at Viterbo, over which the Vicar-General presides. I have been his secretary, I was in Viterbo when Dr. Achilli left it, which took place suddenly. He escaped, or was not to be found. (Laughter.) All the papers of the Bishops' Court and the police were burnt during the last revolution.

Cross-examined by the Solicitor-General.—I can't say with certainty when it was Dr. Achilli left Viterbo, but I believe it was in 1834, and I must have been about thirteen years of age then. I received a subpœna to appear in this case about the beginning of last December. Mr. Flannigan, an Irish priest, first spoke to me on the subject in Broadway, Worcestershire, where I am a priest. I have been abroad since collecting evidence. I saw Rosa de Alessandris once in Rome, and once afterwards at Viterbo. I neither gave nor offered her nor anybody else money in reference to the subject. I have seen a great many people at Viterbo on this subject. None of the witnesses who have come to this country are here on my persuasion. The persons I saw came to me spontaneously, for I did not seek any of them. I went alone, and put myself in communication with the Vicar-General Casamicono. I also knew a monk named Zopini, a Dominican. I know the witness Giustini, I saw her in Rome. The Vicar-General was the first person I applied to at Viterbo, but every day I had people coming to me. Dr. Newman employed me to go over to Italy. The Vicar-General and Zopini expected me, and I remained at Viterbo about 15 days. I was in Rome seven or eight days, but during that time communicated with none of the ecclesiastical authorities. I saw Mr. Harding and Mr. Gordon, and another whose name I do not remember.

Cross-examined by Mr. Bramwell.—I saw at Viterbo the chief of police. I told Rosa de Alessandris to come to England, but she refused, being in the family way.

[An attempt was here made to put in evidence a copy of a private memoradum by the chief of police, which it was understood supplied the information lost in the destruction of papers that took place during the Revolution; but, though the copy so tendered was authenticated by the city arms of Viterbo, it was held inadmissible.]

Sophia Maria Balisano was the next witness called.—She is a middle-aged woman, belonging, like Giustini, to the humbler classes, and gave her evidence in a quick, rapid manner and with a good deal of gesticulation. She was examined by Mr. Baddeley, and replied in her native language, which was thus rendered by the interpreters,—I shall have been married eight years on the 11th of November next, and my maiden name was Principe. I was twenty-eight years of age when I married, and before that lived at Naples. I knew Dr. Achilli there, and became acquainted with him when about thirteen or fourteen years of age. I at that time frequented the church of St. Peter for prayer, and first saw Dr. Achilli in the sacristy of that church, who was Prior, when I went to make a small offering of money at the images of one of the saints. At first he said nothing, but I went one day alone, and he shut the door of the sacristy and embraced me closely. I wished to leave, but he prevented it, and dishonoured me. (Sensation.)

Mr. Baddeley.—Did he use violence to effect his purpose?

Witness.—Yes; he threw me on a kind of sofa. I tried to get away, and struggled hard with him. I was then a virgin, but in consequence became

pregnant. Before my confinement my father and mother went to Dr. Achilli; I, however, was not with them. I remonstrated with him at the time, and said it was a harm and an evil he was doing; but he replied, that it was no harm—that it was rather a good than an evil.

Mr. Baddeley.—Was this in the sacristy?

Witness.—Yes. I did not return from the church by the same door at which I entered.

Mr. Baddeley.—Did he make you any presents?

Witness (with great contempt).—A bit of sweetmeat from time to time. (Great laughter.) The thing produced great distress in my family, and my father died from illness arising out of it.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—I left Naples on the 16th of January, and my mother accompanied me to Civita Vecchia. A Dominican Father named Scrouli induced me to come to England.

The Attorney-General.—How did he know you had anything to say on the subject?

Witness.—Because I went to the tribunal at Naples, and it was a well known thing. The trial took place in Naples about 13 or 14 years ago. In coming to this country everything I have required I have had, but no money, for it was not necessary. I came alone a great part of the journey, but it is a Phillipian Father who has taken care of me, and I don't know what or how much he has paid. I have been in England about two months, and while in Paris met with the witness Giustini. We are now living together, and we have talked together about the business. I have not conversed with any priest since coming over to give evidence. When I went to put money under the image of the saint I saw Dr. Achilli alone. There were other people coming to pay, but of Dominican monks none except him. The sacristy was a first room; there was a second where the vestments were kept, and there was a third where he sat. The door of the sacristy was in one way, and the entrance to these other rooms in another. I went to the sacristy to put down my name, but the money was paid at the end of the year, and this was done by many. I used to go at different hours, when I knew that Dr. Achilli would be engaged on this particular business. It was in the morning, about 9 or 10, when the act happened, and between November and December, but I do not remember the exact date. I went through the church to get to the sacristy, and there were many people in the church at the time. I went in and presented a little book, which he took and turned over. He then locked the door, and I felt some fear, but he said, "Be quiet, or shame will grow out of it." I kept on saying that I wanted to go out. I said "You are a priest let me go;" and he replied "Oh, this is no sin." (Laughter.) I did not scream, I did not know as much as I know now. I did not, however, faint or lose my consciousness. He kept saying to me "quiet!" but he did not put his hand on my mouth, and if I had been able to call I could have done so; but I had not the strength. I stood a quarter of an hour after the act was committed.

The Attorney-General.—Why?

Witness.—Because he said to me "You are all red in the face now. You had better wait and go out by the monks' entrance, and not through the church." The exit from the sacristy in that way was also locked, but with a sort of latch, and not a large key. Dr. Achilli showed me the way out, opening the door and looking if there was anybody about the entrance. I did not at first tell anybody of what had happened, but when I increased so much in size that I could not conceal the fact I told my mother. Dr. Achilli knew that I was in the family-way, but denied that he had anything to do with it. He gave me sweatmeats both before and after the act happened, and previously inquired if I had brothers and sisters. Dr. Achilli resided in Naples a year or more after I spoke to my mother.

This terminated the cross-examination, and at past 4 o'clock the Court rose, reserving the re-examination till next day.

SECOND DAY.—Tuesday, June 22.

The Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, and Mr. T. F. Ellis appeared for the Crown; and Sir A. E. Cockburn, Mr. Sergeant Wilkins, Mr. Bramwell, Q.C., Mr. Addison, and Mr. Badeley, for the defendant.

When this case was called on this morning, the defendant's witnesses were not forthcoming, in consequence of which the Court was kept waiting for some time.

Lord Campbell called the defendant's attorney, and asked why his witnesses were not here?

The attorney said he had sent two clerks for them to Manchester-buildings.

Lord Campbell said the attorney ought to have got them here by nine o'clock.

In about ten minutes the witnesses arrived.

Sophia Maria Balisano was again put into the box and examined. I paid the money to the images of my own will. There were many others who did so. We were not called by the name of any society. We all received a paper like this from Achilli. I don't know whether they began after Achilli came to the church of St. Pietro. I have not been to that church since. I do not remember his leaving. The last time I saw him was just before my mother heard of this circumstance. I went before the police about Dr. Achilli. I saw the commissary of police. All was reported that had happened. My father and mother went there also. I did not see Achilli there. I received the sweetmeats in the church. I never spoke to him in the streets. I visited him afterwards in the sacristy, and the same thing was repeated.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—I went before the commissary of police before I was confined, when I was four or five months gone with child. Dr. Achilli was yet in Naples. It was Dr. Achilli who first applied to the police. The question was again put, and the witness said, Yes, and he caused my father to be called before the commissary. I never saw Dr. Achilli before the police. I did not accompany my father when he went before the police. I was once before the police. The affair was repeated seven or eight times, but I can't say how often. This was in November and December till Quadragesima, till my mother knew of it. Dr. Achilli did not leave Naples till some time after. Dr. Achilli brought my father before the police to say my family haduttered this calumny against him, which was not true; and this was a calumny.

Re-examined by Sir A. E. Cockburn.—My father was called a second time before the police, after I had made the complaint. The commissary had informed himself between the two complaints whether I was an honest girl, and then sent for my father, and gave the papers to another tribunal. My father was sent for a third time, and some other times, as his knowledge of it increased. [This examination was then dropped, as the witness was not speaking of her own knowledge, and her father was dead.]

Gaetana Principe, examined by Sir A. E. Cockburn.—I am the mother of the last witness. I do not remember the month nor the year when this happened. My daughter was not then married. She was 13 or 14 years of age. I saw her weep and ill; but I did not know what was the matter with her. I inquired of her, and she told me everything, weeping. She told me the name of the father of the child. Up to that time she had always conducted herself well. I saw Dr. Achilli about this matter. It was about Lent. Dr. Achilli was in a procession. I and my husband took him aside and called him into a house, and told him the affair. He was angry. He said it was not he. He said, "Observe carefully, I am a priest." On hearing this matter, he said he had nothing to do with it. [The interpreter was here changed, as he did not appear to understand the witness's *patois*.] He said he was a priest, and he would apply first to Divine justice, and then to the laws of his country. It was I who said this. He then said, "Go to the devil, if you like; to me it matters nothing." He caused me to be called before the commissary of police. I went there. He also caused my husband to be called, and we both of us went. That was a few days after. It

was Dr. Achilli who caused us to be called. Dr. Achilli was not present before the police when we appeared. Dr. Achilli stated to the police that a low, poor family had calumniated him, and the police sent to know. The commissary told us to take our daughter before him. We did so, because he wished to see the age of our daughter. The commissary caused my daughter to confess everything that had happened. Neither I nor my husband was punished by the police. I don't know how soon after Dr. Achilli left Naples. We lost sight of him.

Cross-examined by the Solicitor-General.—I am 59 years of age. I do not know whether I was 24 or 25 years of age when my daughter was born. She was born in Naples. I was born in Naples, and I never left Naples. My husband was a baker. We had no other employment. I can only suppose this happened 13 or 14 years ago, but I cannot mind all this. My husband died three or four years afterwards of a disease of the heart. I did not know Dr. Achilli before this. I knew him by sight. I saw him preaching in all the churches. I could not tell exactly how long after this Dr. Achilli remained at Naples. That could be learned from the police. It might be four or five days after this happened that I saw Dr. Achilli in the procession. The investigation before the police may have lasted three or four months. Dr. Achilli made the complaint about a month after I saw him in the procession. Dr. Achilli did not preach in the churches of Naples a year or more after this. I never saw him after I first spoke to him; then I never saw him any more. My daughter lived with me three or four months after her confinement. I was obliged to send her to work. She went to work. I used to take her there, and to fetch her back. My daughter married eight years ago. My husband died one year after the marriage of my daughter.

Antonio Russo, examined by Sergeant Wilkins.—I am a native of Malta, and a resident at Corfu. I carry on the business of a carpenter. I know one Garamoni, a tailor, at Corfu. I remember walking one night in November, 1844, with Marino Venice. In the street of Via Nello we passed the house of the mother-in-law of Garamoni. As we passed the house Garamoni opened the door. He called me within, and said to me and my friend, "See, here is a Catholic priest, Achilli!" I saw Achilli on the stairs, near the apartment of the wife of Garamoni. This was about 11 or half-past 11 at night; I don't exactly remember. It was dark, without a lamp. I took hold of him, and said, "What are you doing here?" He, trembling, answered, "Me? nothing." I knew it was Achilli, because Garamoni called out, and a lamp was brought. Garamoni was very angry, scolding his wife, and his mother-in-law also, and even Achilli. Garamoni called out for a constable. Achilli then was trembling, but did nothing. When the light was brought, the police not being there, Achilli slipped through and escaped. He went away like a horse. (Laughter.) I and Venice were afterwards called before the Court, about eight or nine days after. Depositions were taken before the tribunal. I and Venice were called and examined before the tribunal. I know Garamoni was in England for some time, for two months and a half or three months. He left, I think, about a month ago.

Cross-examined by the Attorney General.—I came over to this country with Garamoni. I lived with him here. I know Captain Lawrence, the inspector of police at Corfu. I can't tell exactly when Garamoni left this country, because I went away for two or three months, about the time of his (Garamoni's) departure. I went to Dieppe, to Paris, to Marseilles, and then to Corfu. I then came back here. I had not heard of Captain Lawrence's arrival in England before I left England, I learned that in Corfu. I did not tell Garamoni, because everybody in Corfu knew it. When I came back to England, Garamoni was in Corfu. He remained there. I have had the misfortune to be once in prison at Corfu. I was put in prison for two or three hours for some youthful trifle. On account of condemnation I was only put in prison once, because I beat my brother. Some other times I was in prison for youthful trifles. I was once calumniated. That was on a charge of theft. I do not recollect whether I was in prison two, three, or four days for that. I cannot swear I was not in prison four times, because when I was a child I was taken up by the police and

put in prison. I cannot swear I was not in prison in 1840, 1843, 1844, and 1845; I cannot recollect. I was never in the house of Garamoni's mother-in-law before this time. I do not know whether Garamoni lived with his mother-in-law, or with his wife. When Dr. Achilli ran away, he ran on the Esplanade, but I do not know where he ran. I do not know whether Dr. Achilli lived next door to Garamoni's mother-in-law. I never knew Dr. Achilli before that evening. I did not know him in the least. I never saw him after this fact. I was called before the Court of Corfu on this affair. I gave no testimony of it.

Re-examined by Mr. Sergeant Wilkins.—Once only I was calumniated, but it was not true. The trifles I spoke of were for being in the streets and intoxicated. When Garamoni said it was Achilli he called out pretty loud. Achilli did not speak. The wife of Garamoni held up the lamp. Her husband obliged her to hold it up.

Pietro Boccheciampi, examined by Mr. Addison.—I am a native of Cephalonia. I knew Dr. Achilli at Ancona in 1841. Dr. Achilli sought my acquaintance. His object was to go to Corfu. I had a passport for Corfu. Dr. Achilli asked me for permission to insert his name in that passport. I gave the passport to Dr. Achilli. He then went to the English Consul. His name was afterwards inserted in the passport. Dr. Achilli said he could not get out of Italy for want of a passport. He had no money to pay for his passage. I paid for it. I was afterwards repaid.

Mr. Addison.—Had you any difficulty in getting repaid?

The Attorney-General objected to the question. This was not one of the twenty-three charges.

Lord Campbell intimated the question might be put.

Examination continued.—I had a difficulty in getting repaid. I saw Achilli at Corfu. I called at his house there. I saw a young woman there. Achilli said she was his servant—the wife of his servant. He did not mention her name. There are parts of the town at Corfu which are frequented by prostitutes.

Mr. Addison.—Are those parts so confined to prostitutes that those who go there are known to go there to be with them? (Roars of laughter.)

Examination continued.—I have seen Dr. Achilli there more than once.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—It was not 1841, but 1842, when Dr. Achilli accompanied me to Corfu. It was after Dr. Achilli had been confined in the prisons of the Inquisition. He was introduced into the passport as tutor.

Giovanni Patrignani, examined by Mr. Badeley.—I am a jeweller, at Corfu. I know Dr. Achilli; I saw him and knew him at Corfu; he has come several times to my shop. I became acquainted with him in 1843 or 1844. I know Garamoni, the tailor. I received communications from Garamoni, which led me to make observations on Dr. Achilli's conduct. Garamoni told me one evening to observe. I went one evening with Garamoni opposite the street where Garamoni's house was, and where his mother-in-law's house was. We were watching from half-past nine or ten up to eleven o'clock. At that time we saw nothing. Garamoni said, "Let us go and see if my wife is on the balcony." We went to see, and no one was on the balcony. We heard the door of Garamoni's mother-in-law, where Garamoni's wife lived, open. I saw a man come out; by his stature it appeared to me to be Dr. Achilli. I was at the distance of across the court. I knew Dr. Achilli then; he had been to my shop. On leaving the house I no longer saw him, because Achilli's house was close by. I did not see him go to that house; he went that way: this was after eleven. I also knew a person called Coriboni. His wife's name was Albina; she lived in several houses, because she was a woman of bad character. I had no conversation with Dr. Achilli about Coriboni's wife; I never saw her with Dr. Achilli, or at his house. [This witness was not cross-examined.]

William Reynolds, examined by Sir A. E. Cockburn.—I was employed at Zante for twenty-five years, and have now retired on a pension. From 1842 to 1851 I was Collector of Customs and Inspector of Health. I remember Dr. Achilli being brought to my house by Captain Ford and his daughter; this

was in the autumn of 1844. He asked my co-operation and assistance in establishing a church in the island. He took a house for that purpose. It was opposite mine. I used the utmost exertions to get a good congregation, for which purpose subscriptions were afforded. The chapel was opened at the end of 1844 or beginning of 1845. The first time I went to the chapel I was struck by the appearance of a woman of notoriously bad character, who was sitting at the door, and acting as doorkeeper. I knew her by sight from the circumstance of having seen her in Cephalonia, where, for three years, she carried on the same kind of life—that of a prostitute. Her dress was different from that of others, which attracted my attention. She did not dress like the Greek women. I frequently passed her house when I went to see my friends. She was always standing at the door with her breast very much exposed. Her character was notorious. She was a married woman at Cephalonia. Her husband was a chorus-singer. He followed Dr. Achilli into the chapel, and acted as his clerk, reading the Church of England prayers. I called upon Dr. Achilli the first thing next morning, and told him I should be excessively sorry to deprive him of good servants, whom I dare say he had taken on the recommendation of some person, as they were compatriots of his, but it was exceedingly improper to keep such persons. I told him everything I knew about the woman and her husband. To the best of my belief, he told me he was already aware of her previous life; that he hoped she had become a second Magdalen; and that he considered it his duty, as a clergyman, to continue his protection to her. I believe I rejoined he was perfectly at liberty to give what charity he liked, but it was very improper to force her upon the congregation; and that if I saw her or her husband there again I would walk out of the church directly—and I was convinced, if I did so, all the rest of the English would follow my example. I had my daughter and my servant with me at that time. My house was opposite the gable end of Dr. Achilli's. There was a lower house between, but from my bedroom window we could see into a room which was used by this woman as a laundry. The width of the street was about fifteen feet. I have several times seen Dr. Achilli in his shirt sleeves (I could not see the lower part of his dress), and the woman in her open undress, working at her irons. Her shoulders were almost bare. She was ironing. I have seen Dr. Achilli put his hand on her shoulders and her breasts, talking and laughing all the time. I have seen this several times. We used to keep our blinds down. I thought it a very improper sight for my daughters to see. There were one or two houses which commanded a view of this. Mrs. Reid's was one. She is dead. She kept her blinds down. After I had witnessed these familiarities, I saw Dr. Achilli again. I called upon him, and mentioned this subject. He still persisted in her being a Magdalen; and that it was his duty to support her, when all the world was against her. I spoke to him about what I had seen. I charged him with being exceedingly familiar with his servant, but I did not go into all the particulars. I said, I have seen so much going on that I think it necessary to stop it. I advised him to send her away. I saw him a third time on the subject, at my house: he used frequently to come in to tea. I requested my wife to leave us alone, as I wished to communicate what I had seen. I then told him what I had seen. He became excessively violent. I insisted on his sending the man and woman away. I do not remember what he said. He never distinctly denied the connection with the woman. I never charged him with any connection.

Lord Campbell observed that the last observation but one made by the witness was exceedingly improper.

Examination continued.—He did not deny the familiarities. My wife came down stairs, hearing us talk very loud, and the matter dropped. I went to his house previously, I suppose to visit. It was after I remonstrated. I went through his bedroom. There was a bed with two pillows. I said, "So you sleep double, or, there is a double bed." I don't remember how he turned it off. In the dining-room I observed the table was laid with two covers. I a ologized for intruding, as I said I thought he was going to have a friend to

dinner. He said I did not intrude; he only had the dinner laid for poor Albina; he made her dine with him. I remember one evening when the band was playing near the Mole. I had some friends with me. Dr. Achilli came behind me with this woman leaning on his arm. There were thousands of people. The band was playing on the water. It was eleven at night. I then paid up my last subscription, and went there no more. All the English subscribers quitted on account of this business—on account of this woman. The matter excited much conversation.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—I arrived here on the 15th of February last. I left the Ionian Islands on the 6th of February. I was then residing at Malta. I resided in the Ionian Islands till February, 1851. I was collector of customs up to that time. The chapel continued open from 1844, or 1845, till July, 1845. Coriboni's wife only acted as doorkeeper once. Coriboni only acted once as clerk. They did not attend the church. It might have been a month before I observed these familiarities. It might have been in April. It was in an upper window. There were glazed windows, and jalousies which opened outside. The jalousies were open. I saw these familiarities five or six times. I can't say how many. They were all of the same kind. I did not stay to see. They continued in the same way after I remonstrated. The windows were still open. Dr. Achilli was quite aware of it. I had told him that I had seen it, and he continued it. He stood behind her. I attended the chapel once or twice after this. I ceased to be a member of the congregation in June or July. These familiarities began in April or May. I can't say when I made the last remonstrances. Dr. Achilli never remonstrated with me for intemperance. I am not an intemperate man by any means. I may have been at a dinner party. He never remonstrated, and I am not intemperate. If I had been I should not have served the Government nearly twenty-five years. Mr. Reid is living in this country, but he is infirm, and nearly blind. Dr. Achilli took me round the house to show me all the rooms. The bedroom was on the third floor, below the laundry. I have talked to Lieutenant Stoney about this matter. I think I told him the reason why I suspected something was wrong was because I saw two pillows on the bed and two covers on the table. I know Captain Constantine Reid. He was in the Ionian Islands with me. I was asked by a letter from Mr. Lewin (the solicitor for the defendant) to go to Corfu and meet a legal gentleman. I told them (the Messrs. Lewin) what I knew. That was in November or December last. I wrote from seeing the circumstance in the papers. I have no relations of the Roman Catholic persuasion. At Corfu I found a Roman Catholic gentleman named Dr. Scandella. I know a person who goes by the name of "Parson Mitchell." I did not see him there. I have not been paid yet. I am to be paid according to the tariff of merchants, and by the English tariff. I am told it is a pound a day. I expect to receive a pound a day from the first day up to this time. The labourer is worthy of his hire. (Laughter.) I subpœnaed some of the witnesses, the Italian ladies. I did not give the witnesses notice that the trial was deferred. I gave notice to Stoney. After I withdrew I did not chance to meet him (Dr. Achilli) again. When Dr. Achilli drank tea with me, this was the third time I remonstrated. He dropped in by accident. Neither my wife nor my daughter saw these familiarities. My servant did. She is here. She sat at the window. There were from seventeen to twenty-five attended the congregation. I never saw Dr. Achilli after I withdrew. This is my handwriting, and this. [Two letters were put into the witness's hand.] I was at the Bridge Hotel, Blackfriars. I was called home, "thanks to Parson Mitchell." He had given in my name with several others as witnesses. [The learned Attorney-General here read two letters written by the witness to Lieutenant Stoney on the subject of this inquiry, and asking him to be a witness. In one of them he said the defendant was disposed to be "very liberal," and he need not be ashamed of appearing, as Lord Shaftesbury and others were to be called.] Stoney said he would not come up unless he was paid, as he was an officer with small private means.

No one ever authorized me to say that the defendant would be liberal. I have not seen the woman since 1845. There is no mistake about the window. There was but one.

Re-examined by Sir A. E. Cockburn.—I was asked to serve the subpœnas because I was going to the house. I had known Lieutenant Stoney several years. When I was at Portsmouth in March he said he could not afford to come up at his own expense. I believe he was then willing to be a witness. I am a Protestant.

Rosina Lavandrie, a nursery governess, residing at Geneva, was servant with Mr. Reynolds in 1844, and continued there till 1851, when the family left the Ionian Islands. She remembered a family named Ford visiting Mr. Reynolds and introducing Dr. Achilli, whom she then saw for the first time. She went to the new chapel when it was opened, and Coriboni's wife was there on her knees before the door. She acted as doorkeeper, and her husband as singer. Witness, when her mistress was ill, sat in a room adjoining, to be within call, and could see thence into a room of Dr. Achilli's house used as a laundry. There were venetian blinds on the window at which witness sat, and witness, therefore, could not be observed, though she could see very well. Witness had seen Coriboni's wife and Dr. Achilli several times in the laundry. Witness saw Coriboni's wife very much uncovered about the neck, and Achilli in his shirt sleeves, and acts of great familiarity between them.

Sir A. E. Cockburn.—Will she describe them?

Witness had seen Dr. Achilli place his hand several times within the bosom of Coriboni's wife, and had seen the two walking arm in arm in the public streets towards the evening. Witness had never seen Coriboni and his wife together. The interior blinds of Mr. Reynolds's windows were closed, because Mrs. Reynolds was ill, and could not bear daylight. As this took place, Dr. Achilli's window became more open.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—Witness had come over from Geneva about a fortnight ago, and had been informed of the matter by letter a few days previously by Mr. Reynolds. Witness now lived with Madame la Plume, whose husband held an office under Government. Her expenses had been paid by Mr. Reynolds. Coriboni lived in the same house with his wife. Witness was very much shocked at what she saw, and always turned away. She only could see what was going on before the window. There was only one window which commanded this view of the laundry in Dr. Achilli's house. The familiarity spoken of continued for three or four months. Witness mentioned them to Mr. and Madame Reynolds and the young lady, who was then fifteen years old. The young lady used to see it herself. Witness was now twenty-nine years old. Witness and the family ceased to speak of it, but other people did.

Re-examined.—Witness was a Protestant. The blind of the window which looked towards Dr. Achilli's house was kept down in order that what took place there might not be seen, as well as to shut out the light from Madame Reynolds.

Vincenzo Barca, for twenty-three years resident at Corfu, and an armourer by profession, remembered Dr. Achilli there in the character of a Catholic priest. Witness was told that he had become a Protestant, but did not know the fact. He had seen Coriboni's wife in public as a bad woman, and he had seen Achilli go into the house where she lived. Coriboni with his wife and Achilli were said to have left Corfu for Zante together, and he missed them on the same day.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—Witness did not know that Achilli lived in the same house as Coriboni and his wife.

Re-examined by Sir A. E. Cockburn.—Coriboni's wife came to Corfu as a figurante, and before Dr. Achilli, who arrived, witness believed, in 1843.

The Rev. George Hadfield, examined by Sergeant Wilkins, said: I am a clergyman of the Church of England, now residing at Whitchurch, Hants, and in August or September, 1846, was appointed Principal of St. Julian's Protestant College, Malta. After the vacation of 1847 I returned to Malta. I am acquainted with Dr. Achilli, who, on the 19th of July, was appointed Italian theological teacher, and on the 11th of December arrived to take up his appoint-

ment. Before his arrival a person named Ciozzi had made accusations against two priests—one named Leonini and the other Saccares—members of the college, and professed Protestants. They were residing in a house appertaining to the college, and were missionary students. In consequence of these accusations I communicated with the committee in London, and at their request inquired into the charges. The committee consisted of the Earl of Shaftesbury, chairman, Earl Waldegrave, and others. At the desire of Crozzi a meeting took place at the Mission-house, which was the residence of Dr. Achilli and the accused priests. Mr. Brian, the Vice-Principal, took the chair, and Dr. Achilli was also present. Ciozzi was called on to state the nature of his accusations against these priests.

Sergeant Wilkins.—What were they?

Witness.—One of the two, Leonini, was charged with having committed adultery in the house with a Maltese lady. A servant of the lady had brought letters frequently to the house. The other was accused of sleeping out of the house, and having frequent connection with prostitutes. Achilli had lived with these men in Malta in the early part of the same year. The priests denied the charge, and the case was for the time held not to be proved. Dr. Achilli then called Ciozzi a calumniator, but the latter persevered. Some time after Ciozzi was called on to substantiate his charges within a month, or withdraw them. Mr. Tucker produced Dr. Bonavia, whose statements were sent by me in writing to Dr. Achilli. Dr. Bonavia said that he had heard from one of the two accused priests, named Saccares, similar revelations to those mentioned by Ciozzi. On giving the statement to Dr. Achilli, on the 10th of February, I told him that I would send it to the committee in London. On the 19th of February I had a letter from Dr. Achilli, announcing that he had need of Mr. Saccares for an important mission; that he started at once, and consequently no longer belonged to the college. Saccares left accordingly. I quitted Malta for England on the 24th of April, 1848, and Dr. Achilli arrived soon after.

Sergeant Wilkins.—Was he dismissed?

Witness.—The resolution rather was that he had resigned. I returned to Malta in July. The chairman of the committee desired me to dismiss Leonini, and Ciozzi continued to teach till after I left Malta, when he returned to the church of Rome. I have had conversations with Dr. Achilli which enable me to say that he was well acquainted with the charges against the two priests.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—Dr. Achilli's pupils were Italian seceding priests. They increased in number from three to seven, including Achilli himself. Ciozzi also was one of them, and taught the Turkish language. Dr. Achilli was the first and the last. He left Malta after me.

The Rev. Alexander Watt, formerly clerical secretary to the Malta College, corroborated the evidence of the preceding witness. He said: Dr. Achilli was anxious that I should suppress all the documents, and deliver them to him, and he stated that it would be of no use to bring them before the committee. The committee, however, invited the Bishop of Gibraltar to investigate; but his Lordship declined, on the ground that Saccares, one of the principal witnesses and an accused, had been sent out of the way by Dr. Achilli. The committee, on that representation, deprived Dr. Achilli of his office, and closed the branch of the college under his charge. On the 26th of September, 1848, Dr. Achilli addressed a letter to Lord Shaftesbury, regretting that his Lordship and other members of the committee allowed him to leave London for his mission, "so embittered as he was; still, he loved them as much as ever in the Lord." He had acted for the general interests of religion, and God forbid that any illwill should exist among them towards each other. "Do not allow," he added, "that I should leave this place without receiving at least a word of Christian friendship. Even to servants, when they are no longer wanted in a house, a certificate of good service is given, and the whole of the month's wages is paid. I have been sent away without a letter of love; and for my stipend, which was to be paid for the whole year, I have only received nine months." In answer to that letter a reply was sent, stating that at the last meeting of the committee,

held on the 15th of November, they had requested me to intimate that, after being absent from his duties a whole month without leave, they were greatly dissatisfied, especially as they did not wish him to come to England on the business of the committee. He had addressed no letter of explanation to them either as to his own absence from his duties, or as to sending Saccares away on a mission of his own. The last fact took place when the most serious accusations were adduced against Saccares, and the ends of justice had been defeated thereby. The accused had been deprived of the opportunity of clearing his character, and the committee had, therefore, additional cause of dissatisfaction with him. The letter further stated that Dr. Achilli's stipend was paid quarterly, and that he had expressed himself perfectly satisfied when he signed the acknowledgment for the payment made. It concluded by saying that the committee had determined to withdraw their confidence from Dr. Achilli, and to remove him from an advantageous situation in which he might have rendered most important services to the cause of Italian reformation. I received no answer to that letter.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—A resolution of the committee was passed on the 19th of June, stating that Dr. Achilli was deprived of his office, and ordering that his salary should be paid up. It was, "that Dr. Achilli having voluntarily abandoned his post at Malta, the engagement with him is virtually terminated by his own act; that this resolution be communicated to him, and that his salary be paid up to the same date."

The Earl of Shaftesbury said: I was chairman of the Committee of the Malta Protestant College, where Dr. Achilli was Italian Professor of Theology. Complaints came before the committee first against Leonini, and then against Saccares, seceded priests, and the committee having ordered an inquiry, a charge was brought against Dr. Achilli for sending Saccares out of the way. Dr. Achilli and others had had the inquiry out at Malta committed to them. The committee received a letter from Mr. Hadfield, and another from the Bishop of Gibraltar, on the subject, and on these letters the committee came to the resolution to break up the whole establishment.

Dr. Bonavia said: I was Latin and Italian teacher at the College in Malta for the last three years, and had a conversation with Dr. Achilli as to the charges of immorality against the two ex-priests. I asked him if he had heard the reports against them, and he said that he had. I then asked him if he believed them, and he replied that he did not. He used no expressions of disapproval. I asked him if he thought it judicious to permit those visits which took place at the mission-house at St. Julian's College. I explained that I referred to the visits of a married lady from Valetta to Leonini. Dr. Achilli asked me, in reply, if I thought it wrong? (Sensation.) I told him it was not judicious, in consequence of the reports circulated in town, because such visits would strengthen them, and more especially as they were paid in Leonini's own room. Then Dr. Achilli asked me who told me that it was so. I replied that I was not authorized to mention names, but that the visits referred to were wrong, and would lead to bad results. Dr. Achilli then got up from his chair in a passion, and said, "You are too scrupulous, because you are married. If you were a bachelor, perhaps you would do worse than Leonini." (Sensation.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—What did he say then?

Witness.—"It would be better for you to mind yourself, and not to meddle with our affairs, if you wish to continue in our friendship." He then left me alone in the room and went to join his companions, who were playing cards. Sensation.)

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—I have mentioned what I now state only once before. I have been in London for five months, and am a member of the Maltese bar, but do not practise. I was advised to come to England on this affair by the Vice-Principal of Malta College.

Harriet Harris, an ordinary-looking servant-maid, living at Kensington, said: In 1850, about two years ago, I was hired by Dr. Achilli, who was living in Northumberland-street, Strand. He had just taken a house in Shaftesbury-

crescent, Pimlico, and he engaged me to take charge of it. I went in the morning about eleven o'clock, and found Mr. Castellini making carpets for the drawing-room. Dr. Achilli arrived shortly after in a cab. He told me to put the house to rights, and to make the best of it, as the things had not all come. I saw about dinner, and Dr. Achilli was in and out of the kitchen all day. There was no blind to the kitchen-window, so I took the table-cover, and with two forks was hanging it up.

Counsel.—What happened then?

Witness.—He took very improper liberties with me. There was no one in the house but ourselves, for Castellini had gone away. He put his hand round my waist, and would have done so in other places, but I prevented him. (Sensation.)

Counsel.—Did he do anything else?

Witness.—He kissed me, and I got away from him into the back kitchen, when he followed me, and told me what he had been through when abroad; that he had suffered six months' imprisonment. He then again made attempts to put his arms round my neck and waist and to kiss me. Afterwards he went out, and came home about twelve o'clock, sleeping next room to me; but nothing took place. He made several attempts to take liberties with me, kissing me, when I was not aware of it, before his wife came home. I told Castellini of it, and also my aunt, Mrs. Cadogan. I was not present when my uncle saw Dr. Achilli. Dr. Achilli did not take any further liberties with me after his wife came back. I never spoke of it to her. The next morning after going there Dr. Achilli asked me how I liked my bed, and if I wished for a bedfellow?

Cross-examined.—Mrs. Achilli found fault with me for being dirty in the kitchen, but I gave her warning. I wished, subsequently, to stay, but she refused to allow me. I left before the month was out. I sent some one to her for a character, and she said two or three things that I thought were not right of me. My aunt first spoke to me on this subject.

Re-examined by Sir A. Cockburn.—When Dr. Achilli asked me if I should like a bedfellow I said, "No, thank you, sir." (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—What did he say then?

Witness.—He laughed, and attempted to kiss me.

Mrs. Cadogan said: I am aunt to the last witness, and she complained to me of what Dr. Achilli had done to her about four days after she went into his service. I mentioned the fact to my husband.

Lord Campbell.—Were you not afraid to leave your niece there alone?

Witness.—I did not know he lived there; and I thought he would be less dangerous when his wife arrived. (Laughter.)

Jane Legge, rather a country-looking girl, said: I was in the service of Dr. Achilli about seven or eight months, and left it about ten months ago. I was servant of all work. He lived at No. 3, Shaftesbury-crescent.

Counsel.—Did he take any familiarities with you?

Witness.—Yes, about two months after I went there.

Counsel.—What did he do?

Witness.—I gave notice to leave, and he asked me to stop, which I did. He had kissed me two or three times before then. A day or two after he took liberties with me in my mistress's bedroom. He had connection with me more than once, but I can't say how often.

Counsel.—You became in the family way?

Witness.—Yes. I stayed four months after that, and then I took another situation. I gave notice three times, but mistress asked me to stay, and then she gave me notice. She gave me a very good character. I could not stop in my place, being ill, and was confined on the 5th of November. The child died, and I for a long time had the smallpox. I saw Dr. Achilli about two weeks before I was confined, but was not more than a minute or two speaking to him. He gave me nothing, and I did not mention the subject to him. While at Dr. Achilli's there was a gentleman named Augustini, who lived there.

Counsel.—Did he also have connection with you?

Witness.—Yes. It was not known to Dr. Achilli. Before the trial came on I had been living with my sister, Mrs. Logan. Dr. Achilli came there, not to see me, but a friend of his who lodged in the house. This was after the baby was dead. I spoke to him at my sister's once or twice.

Counsel.—Did he say anything to you about coming here?

Witness.—I told him that I was subpœnaed, and he said, "I had no occasion to go." I told him a week afterwards again, and he said I was to shut the door in the face of those who came to subpœna me." My sister said, "I must tell the truth if I went." I have not spoken to him since.

The Solicitor-General.—When was it that Mrs. Achilli found fault with you for your conduct with men?

Witness.—She never found fault with me. I had a friend to see me, and one night after a party she came down and found a man with me in the back kitchen.

The Solicitor-General.—Was he not put there to conceal him?

Witness.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went there. (Laughter.)

The Solicitor-General.—Did Madame Achilli not say then that she would not keep you?

Witness.—No, she did not.

The Solicitor-General.—How many men came to see you while you were in Dr. Achilli's service?

Witness.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

The Solicitor-General.—That is four that you had connection with?

Witness.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me. (Laughter.)

The Solicitor-General.—Do you know the father of your child?

Witness.—No, sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the young man who came to see me, but no other, and she never saw anything wrong with me. I never said anything to my mistress about Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

Sir A. Cockburn.—You say you can't tell who was the father of your child?

Witness.—I could not swear it.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Why?

Witness.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Had any one else?

Witness (after a pause).—I would not like to swear who was the father of my child. Mr. Augustini had connection with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

Mrs. Logan, the wife of Robert Logan, an engineer, living at Shaftesbury-crescent, Pimlico, corroborated the evidence of his sister (the last witness), who was delivered at her house. She said: A clerk came from Mr. Sims, the solicitor, to inquire about my sister, and in consequence I sent to Dr. Achilli to tell him. He came on the Sunday evening, and said that Mrs. Castellani was employed by Dr. Newman's party, and that Dr. Newman was a very bad man, and he hoped to have him sent to prison. He also desired me, if they came again, to shut the door in their faces. I spoke to him about my sister, and said it had been a great expense having her to keep, and the baby dying. He said, "Yes, yes," and that was all. He came again on the Tuesday morning, and we were subpœnaed, but he said he thought the subpœnas were of no use, and he did not think they could make us go. He also said that he thought Jane had nothing to say against him. I said, "Of course you know what passed between you and her."

Counsel.—What did he say to that?

Witness.—He made me no answer. The same week he came with a letter that he had had. Some gentleman had written it, signing his initials, and Dr. Achilli seemed angry. He told him that "he ought to be ashamed of himself to draw poor domestics into trouble and not see them out of it."

Counsel.—What more?

Witness.—"Without he sent £5 to defray all expenses, he would hear further of it." I said I did not know who had sent it.

Counsel.—What did he say?

Witness.—That it must have come from the same parties as the subpœna. I said I knew nothing about it; that I had said nothing to any one about him. Mr. Chercho, a friend of Dr. Achilli's, was staying at my house, and tried to get my sister into the country. (Laughter.)

Cross-examined.—I can't say where my sister came from to me, but, I suppose, from apartments. I was very angry with Madame Castellani bringing myself and my sister into this business.

Sarah Wood, a girl nineteen years old, and living with her parents at Windsor, said: I was in the service of Dr. Achilli, having been recommended to him by Madame Clement, the head of a charitable institution at Windsor. I went into his employment the year before last, and was with him for seven months.

Counsel.—Did Dr. Achilli take any liberties with you?

Witness.—Yes; about a fortnight after I went. I went up stairs to clean his bedroom out. Mrs. Achilli was gone out. Dr. Achilli came in. He followed me several times round the room, and tried to put his hands round my waist, but I walked away.

Counsel.—Did anything interrupt him?

Witness.—Yes; a knock came to the door, and he ran down stairs and commenced writing. It was my mistress, who had returned for her parasol. (Laughter.) My mistress went out again, and I returned to the bedroom to finish it. Then he came again and tried to kiss me. I walked away and began to cry, when I said I would write to Mrs. Tennant.

Counsel.—What did he say?

Witness.—That I would be a very naughty girl to do so. (Laughter.)

Counsel.—He gave you a book?

Witness.—Yes, a religious book. The title of it was *Come to Jesus.* (Sensation.) A fortnight after I was going up stairs, and he called me to his dressing-room, and said I had not dusted the table. Mrs. Achilli was out. I returned for the duster, and knelt down to dust the table, when, meanwhile, he bolted the door.

Counsel.—What did he do?

Witness.—He took me by the shoulders and threw me on a bed.

Counsel.—What did you do?

Witness.—I tried to get away with all my might, but could not.

Counsel.—Did he have connection with you?

Witness.—Yes.

Counsel.—Was it with or against your will?

Witness.—Against, and I said I would leave his service.

Counsel.—But you did not?

Witness.—No. I stayed five months after. (Laughter.)

Counsel.—Can you write?

Witness.—No. I cannot. I left because I was so ill. I asked my mistress several times to write to Mrs. Tennant, but she could not. At last she wrote to Mrs. Weald, who wrote to Mrs. Tennant, and then my father came for me.

Cross-examined.—The House of Mercy at Windsor is for persons who have misconducted themselves, and I was there for nineteen months. I was sixteen when I went there, having fallen out with my sisters and brothers. I am a Protestant. I fasted during Lent while with Mrs. Tennant, but not with Mrs. Achilli.

Counsel.—Have you a prayer-book to the Virgin?

Witness.—No.

Counsel.—Is this House of Mercy a Roman Catholic one?

Witness.—Some people say so, but I think not. Mrs. Tennant was, I believe, a Roman Catholic, but has turned from it. After Mr. Luin's clerk came to see me I only told him of the first liberties Dr. Achilli had taken with

me. Some days after my father and mother questioned me, and told me to tell the truth, and so I told my mother all. I got a woman named Gilbert to write Mr. Luin. Mrs. Gilbert is an elderly person, and has been living at Windsor.

Lord Campbell.—Were you seduced before?

Witness.—Yes, but my father and mother did not know it. I was sent to the House of Mercy because I had fallen out with my brothers and sisters.

Lord Campbell.—How long before going to the House of Mercy had you been seduced?

Witness.—About six months. I had not been out of my father's house more than three days previously. I have been at school, but came away when I was able to hold a baby.

Lord Campbell.—Was it only one person that you kept company with?

Witness.—Yes; only one.

Catherine Foreman, living at Great Smith-street, Westminster, said: I once lived with a Miss Lambert, at No. 3, St. James's-street, Pall-Mall. I lived with her from 1843 to 1849, and remember Dr. Achilli being there in 1847.

Counsel.—Did he attempt to take liberties with you?

Witness.—He did about six months after he came. As I was putting things on the table he threw his arms round me.

Counsel.—Did he say anything?

Witness.—He asked me to confess to him. (Laughter.) He did nothing else on that occasion, for I jumped away from him. On another occasion he had a map on the table, and asked me to point out the way to a certain street in Clerkenwell. As I leant over the table for that purpose, he pressed his body against me. I said nothing, but came away directly.

Counsel.—You are a Catholic. Did you mention those things to your confessor?

Witness.—Yes; and, in consequence of the advice which my confessor gave me, I avoided being alone with Dr. Achilli. I used to make the boy wait on him; but he generally sent down for me. He used to come in late at night.

Cross-examined.—Miss Lambert carried on business as a dressmaker. I did not tell her of Dr. Achilli's conduct. Mr. Simpson, a Roman Catholic gentleman, residing at Clapham-common, first applied to me on the subject of this trial. I then saw Father Hutcheson at the Oratory; but it was Mr. Luin who has induced me to come here. I have not seen Father Hutcheson more than once. I confessed to Father Maguire on the subject of the liberties taken with me.

Mr. James Vincent Harting, a solicitor, said: I went abroad to collect the evidence to be produced in this trial. My first visit was to Rome, then to Viterbo, then again to Rome, then to Naples, then to Malta, then back again to Rome, and then home. I was in communication at Viterbo with the Bishop, his Vicar-General, the Prior of the Quercia Convent, and the Prior and Cyndic of the Gradi Convent. I communicated also with the police authorities there, and the Apostolic Delegate. I obtained no police documents; the "gonfaloniere," or mayor, assigning as a reason, that they had been destroyed in the last revolution. There were no copies that I received from him; but I received a declaration of what he knew on the subject.

Lord Campbell refused to receive such evidence.

Witness.—I went to Naples, and applied to the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs. The documents which he gave me I now produce. One of them is an examined copy of a letter or report from the Minister of Police to the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs.

Lord Campbell held that such a document could not be received in evidence.

Witness.—I afterwards went to Rome, and applied to the Assessor of the Court of Inquisition for a copy of the judgment of that court on Dr. Achilli. The Inquisition is a tribunal at Rome, having jurisdiction over ecclesiastics in matters of religion. I received a copy from the notary (who is the proper officer to issue it), with the seal of the Court attached.

The Attorney-General objected to the reception of the document; and the witness was subjected to a long cross-examination, in the course of which the fact came out that the introduction to the notary of the Inquisition was by Monsignor Talbot, the Pope's private secretary.

The Rev. Dr. Grant said: I am an English Roman Catholic bishop.

Lord Campbell.—I won't ask of what see. (Laughter.)

Witness said that he had resided fifteen years at Rome, and was head of the college there for some time. He knew the office of the Inquisition in the Vatican, and stated that the copy of the judgment in question was authentic in his belief. The proceedings of the Court were secret; and strangers were not permitted to inspect the papers. He was familiar with the seal of the Inquisition, but he had not seen it in the particular form attached to the document in question, though he believed it was genuine. He had no personal acquaintance with the proceedings in the office of the Inquisition at the Vatican.

The Attorney-General, referring to the 14th and 15th of Victoria, cap. 99, sec. 7, submitted that no proof whatever had been given of the existence of a court "having jurisdiction over the subject-matter;" and that was essential to make the seal of the court authenticate itself.

Dr. Grant stated that the Inquisition had supreme jurisdiction over ecclesiastics, and that the exact character of its jurisdiction differed in different States. The jurisdiction of the Roman Inquisition was partly criminal, and it was partly a court for advising the Holy See on difficult questions of theology.

Counsel.—What is the nature of the criminal jurisdiction which it exercises?

Witness.—It exercises general jurisdiction in heresy and in grievous cases of immorality against ecclesiastics. What I have said takes in the whole of the charges, but there are other crimes which fall under the classification of heresy.

The Attorney-General objected to the mere production of a judgment without any proof that Dr. Achilli was before the Court, or that there was any proceeding. The document might, therefore, be a mere fabrication from beginning to end.

The Solicitor-General also objected on similar grounds. It was against the constitutional law of every civilized country in Europe to receive a judgment on a criminal charge without evidence that the party had an opportunity of defending himself.

Lord Campbell said,: Thank God, in this country the Inquisition does not, and I hope never shall, exist. (Applause.) But, by the law of nations, ample evidence has been given that there is such a tribunal, and, as evidence is now adduced under its seal, there is no difficulty in admitting it *quantum valeat*. Thank God, the jurisdiction of the Inquisition does not extend into this country —(renewed applause); but this country, like other civilized countries, recognises the jurisdiction of other independent States, and therefore I have no difficulty in the world in receiving the document now produced. Though it is the first precedent of the kind, I hope I do so without any the slightest degree of danger to the Protestant religion of this country. (Applause.) I hope it will be understood that I have not received this document as I would a judgment of the Court of Admiralty, but simply as evidence of the allegation in the plea.

The document was then read, and was in effect that, on his own confession, and after a mature examination, it had been found that Dr. Achilli had been guilty of carnal connection with several women in the convent of Viterbo, and of a rape on another woman there; that he had carnally known two women at Capua, and that he had made a young person at Naples a mother. The holy inquisitors deprived him of all ecclesiastical functions for ever, and sentenced him to be sent to a certain convent for three years.

Mr. Reynolds was called to authenticate a plaint in the Civil Courts of Corfu, in which Dr. Achilli now appeared charged with the crime of adultery.

The Rev. W. Nicholls, a Dominican monk, proved that the vows of the order were obedience, poverty, and chastity. Chastity was not taken as a double vow by priests, but they undertook the obligation of perpetual celibacy, which was tantamount thereto.

The counsel for Dr. Achilli having intimated that evidence for the public utility of the libel, if true, would be dispensed with by them,

Sir A. Cockburn announced that the case on behalf of Dr. Newman was closed, and,

It being nearly half-past eight o'clock, the Court adjourned to the following day, at half-past nine o'clock.

The Court-room was crowded almost to suffocation throughout the day.

THIRD DAY.—Wednesday, June 23.

The trial of this information was resumed to-day, and the court was crowded to such an extent that Lord Campbell had more than once to talk of clearing it. Among the other reforms required in Westminster Hall none are more necessary than better and more commodious court rooms. Those at present in use are so inconvenient that whenever a case attracting great public interest occurs in one of them it becomes converted for the time being into a black hole of Calcutta, while the so-called system of ventilation immensely aggravates the evil.

The defendant's case having been concluded yesterday, the prosecutor's counsel proceeded to call witnesses in contradiction of the evidence produced by the defendant.

Dr. Achilli was the first witness called. He is a plain-featured, middle-sized man, about fifty years of age, and his face is strongly Italian. His forehead is low and receding, his nose prominent, the mouth and the muscles around it full of resolution and courage. He wears a black wig, the hair of which is perfectly straight, and, being close shaved, the wig gives to his appearance a certain air of the conventicle. Yet he retains many traces of the Roman Catholic priest, especially in his bearing, enunciation, and gestures, which have a sort of stealthy grace about them. His eyes are deep set and lustrous, and, with his black hair, dark complexion, and sombre, demure aspect, leave an impression upon the mind of the observer by no means agreeable, and not readily to be forgotten. Judging of his intellectual powers, from his physiognomy, and mode of giving evidence, one would be led to say that he was a man of considerable penetration and cleverness. The questions put to him by his own counsel he answered with great clearness and in a calm, unwavering, quiet manner, without any trace of strong excitement or feelings deeply roused. Sometimes a slight contemptuous smile accompanied his denials of opposing evidence, and once or twice he even seemed to treat points merrily. His general bearing, however, was serious, without any excessive display of anxiety or much apparent mixture of cant. Yet at certain portions of his examination, without losing his self-possession, he became more animated. His dark sunken eyes flashed fire as he listened and replied to the questions put. This was particularly the case when he was cross-examined by Sir Alexander Cockburn on the more material points of the libel, and especially when he was confronted by the Italian women who have sworn that he debauched them. The effect produced by these meetings was quite dramatic, the poor women eyeing their alleged seducer with half-timid yet steady glances, while he, his face overcome for the moment with a slight pallor, turned upon them looks that seemed to pierce through them. Dr. Achilli's manner in the witness-box considerably diminishes the effect of the sanctimonious expression which his singularly-fashioned wig gives to his face. He is evidently a man of strong passion and uncommon nerve, and his evidence will be read with universal interest.

The Attorney-General asked him whether he would give his evidence in English or Italian; to which he replied, "I would prefer to give my evidence in English, but as I cannot speak fluently in conversation I would prefer being assisted by an interpreter."

Sir A. E. Cockburn observed that Dr. Achilli could preach in English.

The Attorney-General said reading a sermon was quite a different thing.

Lord Campbell said no doubt the witness would give his evidence best in Italian.

Dr. Achilli was then examined by the Attorney-General, and gave his evidence as follows:—I am 49 years of age. I was born at Viterbo. I was educated in the Roman Catholic faith, in the College of the Jesuits at Viterbo. I entered into the Dominican convent of La Quercia, at Viterbo, as a novice, in the year 1819. I was then 16 years old. I remained there as a novice little more than one year. I then became a professed monk of the Dominican order. After that, in 1821, I went to Lucca to pursue my studies there. In 1824 I entered into priest's orders. I was then under the canonical age. I obtained my orders, being under age, by a dispensation from the Pope. That was at the solicitation of the Duke of Lucca. In the same year I went to Rome to pursue my studies at the College of Minerva there. In the early part of 1827 I was sent to Capranica to preach the Lent sermons. Capranica is in the diocese of Sultri, in the province of Viterbo. I was appointed by the Bishop of Sultri. I have got the patent of my appointment here. In the spring of 1827 I received the appointment as *Lector Philosophiæ* in the Seminary of the Bishop of Viterbo. The appointment is here. I commenced my duties in November 1827. I remained there discharging my duties till 1833 inclusive. On the 6th of October, 1832, I was appointed by the Master of the Sacred Palace to be his vicar in the diocese of Viterbo. That, among other things, made me not only censor of the press but president of the censorship. I have got here my appointment of vicar from the Master of the Sacred Palace. In 1833 I obtained from Cardinal Velzi, Bishop of Monte Fiasconi, unlimited authority to confess persons of both sexes in his diocese. That gave me authority to impose penance and to give absolution. In the same year, 1833, I was appointed, by the General of the Dominicans, prefect of studies and head professor of the College of Minerva. I have got the appointment here. At the end of 1833 I left Viterbo with the Provincial of my order, on a visitation tour of the Dominican convents in Tuscany. I was engaged on that visitation tour about a year. I returned to Viterbo in November, 1834, when the visitation tour was ended. I then stayed in my own convent at Gradi, with the Provincial. I remained at Viterbo only a few days on my return. I was then appointed visitor in another place. In 1827 I was chosen confessor of the Governor of Viterbo by the apostolical delegate. During the whole time I was at Viterbo, and down to 1833, I continued to act as confessor to the Governor. The general authority to confess which I had at Viterbo was renewable from year to year; and it was renewed from year to year down to 1833. When I returned to Viterbo in 1834 I remained a few days, and was appointed visitor to the convent of Nepi. I was engaged there four weeks. I then went to Rome. I arrived at Rome in the month of December, 1834. On the 21st of April, 1835, I had two patents to preach the Lent sermons. I have got them here. One was from the Cardinal Serra, Archbishop of Capua. The authority was to preach in his cathedral at Capua. The other was from the same Cardinal to preach Lent service in the church of Santa Maria di Capua, a collegiate church. I have them both here. I also received authority to confess persons of both sexes. That was an appointment during pleasure. I held that appointment all the time I was at Naples. In 1835 I obtained letters of secularization from the Pope. I produce them. I did not immediately avail myself of them, because I was requested by Cardinal Acton to remain a little longer in my order, till I had better tried my vocation. After this I went to Naples and lived in the Dominican Convent there for four years. During that time, in the month of June, 1838, I went to Rome. I stayed only a month at Rome, and with that exception I stayed all the time in the Dominican Convent at Naples. In the month of June, 1838, I was confessor to the Princess of Saxony, Louise de Bourbon. In February, 1837, I was made free of my order in the province of Naples. I have a minute of my incorporation. I was affiliated. I produce the minute.

On the 3rd of August, 1837, I had a patent instituting me to be Prior of the convent of St. Pietro at Naples. Before my appointment I was Sub-Prior. That was by the Provincial of the order. There is in it, and also in another document, a clause absolving me from all excommunication; that is a clause which is put in all patents which have the power of conferring any jurisdiction. I was also appointed by the Provincial to be his commissary in a cause to be tried in the Convent del ——, near Naples. On the 15th of December, 1838, I was also appointed commissary to conduct an election in a convent at Naples. In 1839 I completed my secularization. I remained at Naples after that as a secular priest for about two years. I then went to Rome. I arrived at Rome from Naples in the year 1841, but I do not recollect the month. In the spring of 1842 I was imprisoned in the Inquisition. I remained in the prison of the Inquisition at that time about three months. I then went to pass the summer in the country near to Rome. I afterwards went to Ancona. From Ancona I proceeded to Corfu. I was assisted in getting from Ancona to Corfu by Boccheiampi. I met him at Ancona, and he said to me he was going to the Ionian Islands, I told him I was going the same way, but I had no passport. He said I might make use of his, because he had a passport for five people, and they were only four. So I took no name, but was No. 5. I remained at Corfu about a year and a half. I went from Corfu to Zante. I remained at Zante about a year and a half; that was till about July, 1846. I then went to Malta. From Malta I came to England. I came to England for the first time in May, 1847. I was then appointed professor at the Malta College. I went to Malta and acted in the duties of my professorship. I returned to England in June, 1848. I remained in England at that time till January, 1849. I then went to Rome. I was married at Rome, on the 24th of June, 1849. I married Miss Heley, an English lady, who had been educated in Italy. Shortly after my marriage I was again put into the Inquisition. I remained in the Inquisition about six months. I was in the Castle of St. Angelo. I was taken out of prison under pretence of giving testimony in a political cause. The French authorities interfered in my favour. After I left Rome I came to England, where I have remained ever since. I have since been minister of the Gospel at the Italian Protestant chapel, in Dufour's-place, till two weeks ago. I have never been deprived of any of my offices. Neither in the month of February, 1831, nor at any other time, did I ever know a person named Elena Valente. While I was at Viterbo I never robbed of her honour any young woman at all. I knew a family at Viterbo of the name of Gentili. There are two families there of the name of Gentili—two brothers. At that time the only woman of the name of Gentili was the wife of Count V. Giulo Gentili. Neither of the families lived in the country. I did not pass my country month in 1831 with the family of Gentili. It was my custom in the month of October to pass my time at the country house of my friends or relations. These families were there—Zelli, Christofori, and Tekeschi. I believe I passed the month with two if not all three. I do not know of any country house of the Gentili. In neither of these three families there was a servant girl with whom I went out to any place. I never went with any servant girl to a place where the two Gentilis were shooting. I do not know that woman. (Elena Valente, now Ginstini, was here brought into court, and confronted with the witness.) I never saw her. (The woman appeared to turn pale.) I never had intercourse with that woman in any place in the world. I never had connection with that woman in the house of the Manchorini or anywhere else. I never gave her, or any other woman, a pocket handkerchief and three sausages. Sausages I never gave to any one, for I never had any. Perhaps a handkerchief I may have given to some old woman; I do not know. (The woman was removed from court.) I do know a person of the name of Rosa di Allessandris, a nun, a relative of mine, of St. Bernardino, in Viterbo. I was never found guilty of having debauched, seduced, and robbed of her honour, Rosa di Allessandris. The one of whom I have spoken is older than I am in age. With her I could not commit any sin, because she is shut in a nunnery. I never was found guilty of having

debauched, seduced, and robbed of her honour a woman of that name. I know of no other woman of that name except my relative. I never had carnal connection with Rosa di Allessandris, in the sacristy of the church at Gradi, or anywhere else. I never gave any money to the father of Rosa di Allessandris as hush money. I think I was a child of five or six when the father of Rosa di Allessandris died. In the month of July, 1834, I did not debauch, seduce, and carnally know a woman whose name is unknown, and who was chaste before. (Laughter.) In 1834 I was on my tour with the Provincial. In 1835 I was not at Monte Fiasconi, nor at Viterbo, nor do I know Vincenza Guerra. I was at Capua in 1835, occupied preaching morning and evening. I resided in the house of the Cardinal Archbishop. I resided all that time under the eyes of the archbishop. I did not in that year, or at any other time, have any connection with any woman who was chaste and unmarried. (The witness Principe, now Balisano, was here brought into court.) In 1840 I was living at Naples as a secular priest. I have never seen that woman. This is the very first time I have seen her. I know this paper very well. The filling up in writing is mine. This was an institution for an image of St. Pietro Martyro to collect money. I did not collect the money, but there was one specially charged to it. Persons came to write their names, but they did not come into the sacristy; they stayed at the door. I never had connection with that woman in the sacristy, or in any rooms off the sacristy, or anywhere. I do not remember walking in a procession when the mother of Principe spoke to me. I was never before the police when any charge was made against me by the parents of Principe. I was never before the police. When I came away from the Dominicans the brethren began to make war upon me, and they spread charges against me. I made no account of this, as is my custom. My friends, irritated at such proceedings, tried in every way to subvert and destroy such charges. The Duke of Lavrino went to the police.

Sir A. Cockburn objected to this evidence.

Examination continued.—I and my friends went to the Duke of Lavrino. I was never before the police with the Duke of Lavrino and my friends. Garamoni's mother-in-law lived next door to me at Corfu. I never committed adultery with Garamoni's wife. I remember a fact that happened. One night I was passing before the house of the wife of Garamoni. She was at the door and called me, asking me to answer certain questions. She began to ask these questions, when we were surprised by her husband. The questions were but begun, but not finished. I believe she meant to ask me if I had heard any noise in her house on the previous night; and I believe she alluded to certain screams or cries that in fact I had heard. Before the questions were finished Garamoni came up. He began very furiously to inveigh against his wife. I was at the door of the house. It appears to me that he pushed me inside the house. Certain it is I made a step within the door. I reproved Garamoni for this his bad conduct to his wife. [The court and passages were so greatly thronged that some confusion arose in the court, and the proceedings were in consequence interrupted for a time.] I made way with my hands and got out. This is the only occasion I was ever in the house. I never met her in any place. Some days after I heard that Garamoni spoke against me through the city. I went to complain to the secretary of the Lord High Commissioner, Mr. Fraser. I have heard that Garamoni wrote certain letters, but no more. When I was at Corfu I had two persons in my service, Coriboni and his wife. They remained in my service all the time I remained at Corfu, and all the time I remained at Zante. They did not come with me to Zante, but they came some weeks after I had gone. I knew Mr. Reynolds at Zante very well. I did duty in a chapel at Zante. Mr. Reynolds was one of my congregation. I lived near him. His house did not look into mine, but mine did into his. My house was higher than his, and I could see his house only from my upper windows. There were two upper windows. I think it would have been necessary (for me) to have put the person out of the window to be seen. I never committed any indecency with Coriboni's wife. I recollect that Mr. Reynolds,

after an event that happened between us, did speak relative to the persons in my service. I had in friendship and charitably given some slight reproof to Mr. Reynolds because he was in the habit, at that time, of drinking a little too much in the evening, and being drunk. (Laughter.) The first time it appeared to me that he received it (the reproof) with resignation. At the second time he became a little displeased. After this he began to absent himself from the congregation. After a certain time I saw no more of him at my congregation. After the reproof I went to pay him a visit, to make friends with him again, and then he, assuming an altogether serious tone, began to reprove me about my servants. He said that they had been, before coming to me, persons not of good morals. I answered that I should be satisfied if they behaved well while they were in my house. I begged him to tell me if he had anything to say against them at that time. I remember that he himself spoke in eulogy of them, only he would have me, at his will, send them away. Coriboni lived with his wife in the house with me. They had a child. Coriboni's wife never slept with me. She never dined with me. I never told Mr. Reynolds that Coriboni's wife, "poor Albina," was going to dine with me. I never walked arm-in-arm with her in the public streets. The band used to play late at night. I never went with Coriboni's wife, late at night, to hear the band play, nor did I ever go alone. My congregation increased very much after Mr. Reynolds left it. I continued to do duty in the chapel about six or seven months after he left—as long as I continued in Zante. I did duty in the chapel to the last moment I was at Zante. The congregation increased up to the last moment. I do not know that woman at all (Principe's mother). No, no, no; I do not know her at all. When I left Zante, Coriboni and his wife left my service. When I was at the college at Malta there were two priests there, Saccares and Leonini. They had been converted from the Romish church. The accusation against Saccares and Leonini was made while I was in London; and the alleged faults were committed while I was away. The accuser was an Arminian priest, to whom, according to my judgment, no credit ought to be given. I was charged by the committee of the Malta College in London to make inquiries into these charges, although I had advised the secretary of the committee not to institute proceedings against these accused persons. I gave as a reason that I knew very well the character of the accused, and that no credit ought to be given to the accusation. I afterwards investigated the matter on my return to Malta with Mr. Hadfield and Mr. Brien. My result was that there was not any credit to be given to the charge, and I have pleasure in adding that neither Mr. Hadfield nor any other person has ever found that the charges were true. It appeared that our inquiries were finished when it came to my knowledge that they were continued secretly on the part of Mr. Hadfield. I complained of this to him and to the Vice-Principal. The Principal answered that he had been charged by the committee thoroughly to investigate. I sent Saccares somewhere. Before I sent him I communicated to Mr. Hadfield that Saccares was going on a commission into Sicily. I did not send him away to hinder and stifle the investigation. I fancy I was not at all implicated in the charges, as they were in Malta, and I was in London. As far as I know I was not implicated in the charges. I was not dismissed from the College of Malta for several acts of vice and immorality. I never preached against the laws of chastity and morality. I am not an infidel. I believe I never was one. There is no time when I did not believe in the truths of Christianity. There was never a time when I did not believe in the divine mission of our Saviour. I came to this country with my wife. I was lodging when in England, in 1847, at No. 3, St. James's-street, at the house of Miss Lambert. I never took any liberties with the servant of Miss Lambert. The second time I was living at No. 20, Northumberland-street; in Shaftesbury-crescent. I had a servant named Harriet, I think. I never conducted myself indecently to Harriet Harris. I never attempted to seduce Harriet Harris. I think I had a servant named Jane Legge. I had two of the name of Jane. One followed Harriet Harris. That Jane lived about six months or so, but I do not recollect exactly.

I never had criminal intercourse with her. I never behaved indecently to her, nor did I ever attempt to seduce her. I remember Sarah, who came from the House of Mercy, at Windsor. I never had criminal intercourse with her, nor attempted it. I was in the prisons of the Inquisition upon two occasions. There was a proceeding in the Courts of the Holy Office against me the first time I was at the Inquisition. I was questioned by the Inquisition every day. I was charged with regard to my teaching in the school, in the pulpit, and the confessional. There was no charge brought against me upon account of my moral conduct. The Inquisition is not competent to try charges of immoral conduct. I was never charged in the Inquisition with immoral conduct. I do not think that I heard that any charge of immoral conduct had been made. I never knew of any charge of immorality being made against me to the Inquisition. I never made any confession to the Inquisition of having had carnal intercourse with any women at Viterbo or elsewhere. [The paper which purported to have come from the office of Inquisition, and which had been put in the day before, was here shown to the witness. The following is a copy of the original in Latin and Italian :]

"Testor ego infrascriptus notarius S. Congregationis Romanæ, et Universalis Inquisitionis, quod perquisitis actis assumptis in S. Officio contra sacerdotem P. Hiacynthum Achilli religiosum professum ordinis Prædicatorum, constat ex eisdem actis, ipsum Achilli, constitutis judicialibus excussum, fuisse reum confessum de carnali copula, dum in cœnobio Viterbiensi moraretur, cum pluribus fœminis habita, item de defloratione alterius virginis in civitate Montis Falisci, aliasque duas mulieres Capuæ carnaliter cognovisse. Eruitur quoque aliam puellam Neapoli matrem reddidisse; ac superiorem ordinis Prædicatorum scutato quinquaginta alteri fœminæ ab eodem Achilli corruptæ pependisse ad damna illata sarcienda.

"Denique fidem facio, quod ob memorata crimina, et alia de quibus in actis maturo prius discusso examine gravaminum ex actis resultantium, perpensis defensionibus, aliisque ex more consideratis, nec non benigne excepta ipsius inquisiti confessione, ejusdemque declaratione sequentis tenoris.—Non chiedo di non esser gastigato, anzi amo—che si proceda severamente sul conto mio in quel modo la giustizia esige. Ricevero, con rassignazione qualunque disposizione venga emanata, ed ove mancasse qualche ragione a procedere con più rigore, la mia confessione sia bastante a punirmi come meglio credera il S. Tribunale.—Emi Inquisitores Generales, Fer. iv., die 16 Junii, 1841, in Conventu S. Mariæ supra Minervam decreverunt: Inquisitus P. Hiacynthus Achilli—prævia suspensione perpetua a celebrando sacrificio Missæ, inhabilitatione perpetua ad quamcunque directionem animarum, et ad Verbi Dei prædicationem, nec non privationis vocis activæ, ac passivæ, et impositis pœnitentiis salutaribus, damnatur ad manendum per triennium in aliqua domo Religiosa sui ordinis strictioris observantiæ.

"In quorum fidem Datum ex Cancellaria S. Officii hac die 22 Septembris, 1851.

"ANGELUS ARGENTI,
"S. Rom. et Univ. Inquis., Notus.

"Testis, fr. VINCENTIUS LEO SALLUA. O.,
"Præd. 1. Socius S. R. Inquis.

"Witness, JOHN GORDON,
"Cong. Orat. Presb., Birmingham.

"Witness, NICHOLAS DARNELL,
"Cong. Orat. Presb., Birmingham.

"Sworn before me at Rome, this 17th day of November, 1851,
"JOHN FREEBORN,
"British Consular Agent, Rome."

[The above document is sealed at the signature with a large seal bearing the insignia of the triple crown, supported by St. Peter and St. Paul, &c., with these words on the margin, "Sigil. S. Roman. et Univers. Inquisitionis," in Roman capitals, and at the foot it is stamped with the seal of the British Consulate, Rome.]

I have read this paper over. I know of no proceeding in which those charges were brought to my notice. I made no confession. I did not throw myself upon their compassion. Perhaps they might have asked me, at the commence-

ment, whether I was content to stand, or throw myself upon their mercy. Upon that supposition I should have answered "Yes;" and then the Chancellor of the Inquisition would naturally have written that I threw myself upon their mercy. I believe that the first words may be admitted, but not the last. I did not ask not to be chastised, if I merited it. On the contrary, I should desire that severer proceedings should be instituted in such manner as justice required. I said I should receive with resignation whatever orders or dispositions may emanate. I cannot admit the rest. If they wanted to proceed with greater rigour, I said my confession would be sufficient. It is probable I may have put in the first part, but not the second. When I made that statement I had not had any charge made against me about deflowering women, &c. It was only as to my teaching. No judgment, no sentence, was pronounced upon me; only a decree of the Congregation of the Holy Office, ordered by the Pope, that I should be set at liberty. I was set at liberty under certain conditions: that I should become reconciled again to the Holy See, and, in the meantime, that I should abstain from the exercise of my ministry. This reconciliation, according to the secret instructions given, consisted in that I should write and publish some book in favour of the Roman Catholic church. I must correct an observation I made, not having sufficiently reflected. My incarceration at the Inquisition took place in 1841, and after my liberation I remained a certain time at Rome, and afterwards, as I said, I went into the country, in the neighbourhood of Rome. These are all the conditions upon which I was released from the Inquisition.

Cross-examined by Sir A. E. Cockburn.—I became a monk in 1820, and took the vows. The Dominicans profess one single vow. The promise I made was in these words:—"I, Giacinto Achilli, promise obedience to God, to the blessed Virgin, to the Patriarch St. Domenico, and to you, most Reverend Father-General of the order, till death." I promised nothing else. I believe a Dominican monk does not take a vow of poverty and chastity. I swear I took no vow of poverty and chastity. If it is not their intention to profess these vows they do not take them. It depends on their will. The vow of obedience is the only necessary condition. I began a priest in 1824. Chastity is part of the obligation of a priest. I remained at Viterbo, with occasional absence, till 1833. During that time I have not had any intercourse with any women, according to the accusation. I had not intercourse with many others.

Sir A. E. Cockburn.—Have you had connection with other women?

Dr. Achilli.—I could answer "No;" but I have the privilege of the judge not to answer.

Lord Campbell said the witness was not bound to answer the question.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Do you decline to answer on account of your privilege?

Dr. Achilli.—I decline to answer on account of my privilege. I never had any intercourse with any woman in the sacristy at Gradi, nor in any house contiguous to the sacristy, nor in any other room belonging to the church. In 1826 I was not sent to La Quercia; I went of my own accord; I did not go as penance. The power given to me to confess was very rarely given. The provincials are changed every two years. Brochetti took me on his visitation tour in 1833. He was a great friend of mine. It is possible that something, some gossip, may have taken place about some charges. Spaletti, vicar to the bishop, made them. I published that book, *Dealings with the Inquisition*. [Sir A. E. Cockburn here read a passage from the book, p. 130.] Spaletti did so, I was told. I did not go on this visitation to get out of the way of these charges. I was at a distance from Viterbo, and did not know what was going on. I started from Rome. There was not a single word of gossip against me when I left Viterbo. There was not, in 1834, a charge made against me of having attempted the virtue of a woman, in Cardinal Velzi's house. I may have heard that charge. I cannot recollect whether it was made before or after I went to Nepi. I did not go to Nepi to get out of the way. I do not recollect that charge. I am not indifferent about these imputations: thousands and thousands such have been made; for instance, when I was in the Castle of St. Angelo, it was said I

had killed a nun, and this was brought before the Government of the French Republic. It is a condition of being secularized that you should have a patrimony.

Sir A. E. Cockburn read from the document of secularization a passage in which the word "*notorum*" was used in reference to Dr. Achilli.

Dr. Achilli.—You may ascertain from two Dominican monks, who will be called as my witnesses, what is the real nature of the vows taken. I obtained a little after a rescript to have a decree of secularization. I obtained my patrimony from my uncle, a few months after. I obtained the rescript in 1839. The Government must concur in the decree of secularization from the Pope. According to the laws of Naples, I was no longer a monk. In order to be secularized, you must obtain the patronage of an ordinary. I was received immediately, but the public act was not received in the Chancery, and therefore I have not got it. It should be written on the brief, but that is not necessary. I never saw Elena Valente before to-day. All three of the parties whom I named had houses in the neighbourhood of Viterbo. Christofori had a house in the neighbourhood: in his house there were a priest, Christofori, a lady, a sister-in-law of the clergyman, and a son of the lady, my pupil. That lady was a Gentili, the widow of Christofori. That October, 1831, I passed in the house of the three parties. I passed part of the time in the house of the widow Christofori, who had been a Gentili. I never saw that woman there; I don't recollect a lame servant there. All the month of October I used to go out shooting. I may have seen ten shooting parties. They are all chases there. Sport is carried on with nets. I used to go out shooting with my gun. The vicar of the Bishop Spaletti used to go out shooting with me.

Lord Campbell said that in Roman Catholic times the bishops in this country used to keep packs of hounds.

Sir A. E. Cockburn.—They were not monks, my lord.

Dr. Achilli.—I thought Spaletti was my friend. I never took any women with me. I used to go with the son of Christofori. I never took a woman, saying I would show her the shooting. I never saw her before to-day. I do not precisely know if I had friends at Viterbo. I am not allowed to correspond with them. I have several relations at Viterbo. I cannot correspond with them: they do not refuse to correspond with me; on the contrary, I know they love me. Since I have been in London I have not attempted to correspond with them. I have thought it better not to compromise them.

Sir A. E. Cockburn asked the witness how he got funds for this prosecution?

Dr. Achilli.—I hope the providence of God will provide me with funds through some friends. They do not exist as yet. I expect to get funds through some friends who I hope will have the kindness to engage for this need of mine.

Lord Campbell.—Are we to inquire into this matter?

Sir A. E. Cockburn.—It is only to show that funds are not wanting.

Lord Campbell.—As far as I can see, funds are not wanting on either side. (Laughter.)

Dr. Achilli.—I have not caused inquiry to be made about Valente, or any other woman, but I have only caused that which was done at Viterbo by my adversaries to be observed, If I were to name the persons who have offered that assistance it would compromise tem with the Papal Government. Rosa di Allessandris, my relative, became a nun long before I became a monk. I never knew any other person of that name. The name Capretta is a name given at Viterbo to all women who have light hair. The Rosa di Allessandris, the nun, had not light hair. I never knew Rosa di Allessandris, a young woman, with light hair. I never gave or caused money to be given for this purpose; nor to be given by my consent or on my account. They have given it on their own account. I have not said of the monks at Viterbo that they were profligates. Among them there are some good and bad. I believe some of them were loose in their lives in regard to women. According to the law, it

was the duty to proceed, and I have been charged by my superiors to proceed, against such. I have got the commission here. As long as I remained among the Dominicans I was their idol. I left there in 1833. In 1835 I was at Capua. I went to Naples, having spent a Lent at Capua. I spent forty days under the eyes and nose of the cardinal; but I appeal to the privilege granted me by the judge. (This was said in answer to a question as to whether he had not had connection with women at Naples.) I did not make attempt on the virtue of the daughter of the chamberlain of the Bishop of Capua. It is quite new. I have said before that I could have answered "No;" but I have the privilege to decline answering, and I avail myself of it. I believe that want of chastity is a real crime for all Christians, but I do not make much difference for clergymen and laymen. I never saw this woman before this day (Principe). I see an Italian face more Neapolitan than otherwise. Her dress confirms me in that opinion. My word is an oath as a Christian. Continually swearing is no use. I respect an oath to compare it with a simple word, but I make a word of the same value as an oath. I swear I never had carnal knowlege of that young woman. I never saw the mother before. (She stood forward.) That woman and her husband certainly never called me out of a procession and charged me with debauching their daughter. No one ever did that; and allow me to state a reason. It is impossible to ask a friar when going in a procession any question at all. No complaint was made to the police against me, nor by me, nor by my friends at my instigation, but because of their affection towards me. They used to tell me after they made the application. They told me that many times. It was a little time only before the police. I did not know the name of the family they brought before the police. It is very possible that they (my friends) have told me the names, but I have dismissed them from my mind. I did not go before police myself, because I knew these things had no reality. I did not receive the money, because I was the Prior, and I had the power to fill up even that employment. The entries in the book were sometimes, not always, entered by me. I did not set this society on foot to obtain the money. I may have written the paper myself, but I believe not. When I got the authorization for secularization from the Government in 1839 there were charges made by Ancorani and Lambruschini. They were the cause of my being taken taken to the Inquisition Ancorani was the Principal of my order. (Sir A. E. Cockburn here read a passage from page 264 of Dr. Achilli's work, to show the terms in which the witness spoke of these two parties.) I speak there for the purpose of making revelations to true Christians. Sometimes it is necessary to name the persons. When I obtained secularization Ancorani was not my superior. Oliveiri was the superior then. Ancorani was the superior when I completed my secularization. When I exhibited the decree of authorization of secularization, which till then was not known, bitter war was begun against me. There was no accusation pending when I completed my secularization. There were no proceedings pending. I did not quit the order to avoid proceedings being instituted against me. I had already addressed my petition to the Government of Naples for my *exequatur* before I heard of proceedings being made against me. It was after I presented my petition that I heard of gossip of the monks at Rome. I have never been suspended from any office I ever held. I terminated my priorate in peace with all the monks. They were about to elect me again to the office when I sent my petition. That was in July, 1839, when my priorate expired. After I sent my petition I received a curious letter from Ancorani. Among other things in this letter he ordered me to set off and go somewhere—possibly to Scurcola. I was no longer under his jurisdiction. I had these orders—to go to Benevento, to Penni, in the Abruzzi, and thirdly to Scurcola. Scurcola is not a convent of severe penitence. Those convents are all small, and where they are small there is no strict observance. He did not send me for three years. Such an order is never given for a determiued time, but during pleasure. I said the letter contained many curious things. He had somewhat lost his wits. He had been for forty-seven years inquisitor, and this is the reason I treated him in that

way in my book. The letter did not say I was sent to Scurcola for immoralities. There was a question in the letter about a convent which wanted reformation. He wanted to change good habits to bad, because he had lost his wits. To same questions I give same answers.

Sir A. E Cockburn.—When you were at Naples had you intercourse with several women?

Dr. Achilli.—To the same question I give the same answer.

Sir A. E. Cockburn.—How came you to leave Naples and go to Rome in 1841?

Dr. Achilli.—Domestic family matters took me there. I went to go on to Viterbo.

Sir A. E. Cockburn.—You were arrested.

Dr. Achilli.—Afterwards, but not then.

Sir A. E. Cockburn.—Where were you arrested?

Dr. Achilli.—At Rome. No proceedings were instituted against me at Naples. I was not removed from the Neapolitan territory. My passport was granted me, and I left Naples freely.

Sir A. Cockburn.—In September, 1840, were you not conducted out of Naples by the police?

Dr. Achilli.—No. I left with an uncle.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did they not direct you to leave and give you a passport to Rome, and did you not return after a short absence secretly to Naples?

Dr. Achilli.—No. I applied for my passport openly, and returned openly. I came back because I was lame and was obliged to keep my bed.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did the police not again remove you after your return?

Dr. Achilli.—No; they gave no such orders. I remained a few weeks, after which I left and went to the neighbourhood. I was arrested in Rome. Having left the Dominican order I had renounced all the employments I held in it.

Sir A. Cockburn.—You say no charge was made against you by the Inquisition on the score of immorality; you say it is not in the jurisdiction of that court. Did you admit that you had preached heretical doctrines?

Dr. Achilli.—There was no occasion to do so, because the Court would not urge it.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you make any admission as to anything with which you were charged?

Dr. Achilli.—Yes. I was accused of preaching the doctrine of justification by faith only.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you in respect of that throw yourself on the mercy of the Court?

Dr. Achilli.—I confessed, and justified myself by Thomas Aquinas. It is a general rule that whoever is accused before the Inquisition is suspended until he is absolved—absolutely. I was not so absolved. I was to remain under surveillance.

Sir A. Cockburn.—How long?

Dr. Achilli.—There was no time specified, but it would be until my final reconciliation with the Holy See. During the time this suveillance lasted I would be prevented exercising the offices of the priesthood, and excluded from any benefice or preferment.

Sir A. Cockburn.—As well as being under surveillance, were you not to remain for three years in some house of severe observance?

Dr. Achilli.—I do not know any such condition, No sentence was ever pronounced against me. All that was done was the decree that I should go out of the Inquisition. The order of surveillance was a part of that decree. I was also recommended, or warmly advised, to spend some time in a place of religious retreat.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Were you not ordered to spend these three years at Nazali, and had you not the police with you?

Dr. Achilli.—I went of my own accord, and there were police with me. (Laughter.) There is a religious house there, but not of strict observance. I went because I was acquainted with some of the monks, who themselves had

invited me. I went about in the neighbourhood. I went to Nazali to collect myself. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—You succeeded in collecting yourself in a fortnight, and then you took yourself off? (Laughter.)

Dr. Achilli.—I was wearied with my confinement in the Inquisition, and went to Ancona to leave the Papal States. Before I started secretly I had written for a passport to a friend of mine at Rome, who said that the Government would not give me a passport, and I was recommended to go back soon to Rome.

Sir A. Cockburn.—You went from Ancona to Corfu?

Dr. Achilli.—Yes, I lived there some months before I took up my residence next to the house of Garamoni's wife. It was about the middle of the time of my staying there that the interview I have stated happened. I might have known Garamoni before, but I doubt it, for I had no regard for him. (Laughter.) I employed him as a tailor. I knew he was not living with his wife. Everybody in Corfu knew it.

Sir A. Cockburn.—What hour was it when this surprise by the husband took place?

Dr. Achilli.—I do not know exactly, but it was not my habit to go home much before eleven o'clock at night. It might have been later; I cannot speak to a quarter of an hour.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Were you in the dress of a priest?

Dr. Achilli.—No, I wore a cloak, and the woman had no time to say what she wanted. The husband did not seize me. He might have pushed against me. He had no quarrel with me.

Sir. A. Cockburn.—But he charged his wife with improper intercourse with you?

Dr. Achilli.—That was his usual habit.

Sir A. Cockburn.—What was his usual habit?

Dr. Achilli.—To be a man of great incivility. (Laughter.) I don't recollect his words, but I think they were "Worthless woman, I have caught you."

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did he not grasp you, while he made his wife hold up the candle to see who you were?

Dr. Achilli (with a smile).—Oh, no; he did not put his hands on me.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you not use force?

Dr. Achilli.—There was the husband and wife and another person. I had to open a passage, but I did not run, for my own house was close at hand, and the backdoor was very near that of Garamoni's. (Laughter).

Sir A. Cockburn.—Have you got Madame Garamoni here?

Dr. Achilli (with a laugh).—Yes.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Have you Madame Coriboni?

Dr. Achilli.—No. At Corfu I had put off my priestly character, and was travelling as a cavalier, but I did not put it in my passport; only on my card.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Where did you make the acquaintance of Madame Coriboni?

Dr. Achilli.—At Corfu, in the summer of 1843. Her husband was a small tradesman. Then he went about with an operatic company, and then he was at the theatre.

Sir A. Cockburn.—And the wife; what was she?

Dr. Achilli.—She was his wife, and lived with him. When I took the husband as my servant she came to the house to see him.

Sir A. Cockburn.—How did you make their acquaintance?

Dr. Achilli.—All the Italians at Corfu sought my acquaintance, and they among the number. She was not singularly dressed, or lightly covered, but, on the contrary, dressed very modestly. I took no trouble to ascertain Coriboni's character. I knew him habitually by sight, and took him to be a good man. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did the lady from her appearance seem a good woman? (Laughter.)

Dr. Achilli.—I had nothing to say of her.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Was she good-looking.

Dr. Achilli.—Neither the one thing nor the other. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you engage then to come to your service before you left Corfu for Zante?

Dr. Achilli.—No. I dismissed them when I left Corfu, and I afterwards sent for them. A part of the house was used for my congregation.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Was Coriboni a Protestant?

Dr. Achilli.—The greatest part of the Italians are neither Catholics nor Protestants. (Laughter.) Coriboni had an antipathy to the Romish church, but he was not a Protestant. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—He was in a transition state, not good enough for a parson, but good enough for a clerk. (Much laughter.) The lady, did she officiate?

Dr. Achilli.—No; but Coriboni continued to act as clerk.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did Mr. Reynolds not, when you first opened the chapel, expostulate with you on seeing these persons employed?

Dr. Achilli.—No; on the contrary, he often used my servant. On two occasions I reproved Mr. Reynolds for intemperance, and did so at the request of his own wife. As far as I could judge he was a habitual drunkard. I have seen him so sometimes.

Sir A. Cockburn.—How long had you known him before you reproved him?

Dr. Achilli.—Some months; and the second time he got angry. Coriboni has gone back to the Roman States.

Sir. A. Cockburn.—Have they become Roman Catholics?

Dr. Achilli.—No; nor Protestants, but negatives. (Much laughter.) I never said that Madame Coriboni was a Magdalen. I would immediately have lost my position if I had been seen once arm in arm with Madame Coriboni. I may have met her in the street coming home, and have come home with her, but only near the house. I left Zante because I had determined to open an Italian church in Malta. A fortnight after my arrival I opened a domestic chapel, and when I left that house I opened an Italian chapel.

Sir A. Cockburn.—What means of subsistence had you at this time?

Dr. Achilli.—I received secretly from my family the means of subsistence, and I also earned some money by my literary labours.

Sir A. Cockburn.—What number of bibles did you charge Saccares to take to Sicily?

Dr. Achilli.—About 50 or 60, from the depôt of the Biblical Society in Malta.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you know that a day was fixed by Mr. Hadfield for hearing the case against Saccares?

Dr. Achilli.—No.

Sir. A. Cockburn.—Did he not tell you he was going to resume the investigation?

Dr. Achilli.—No. (Sensation.) I engaged the woman Harriet Harris while living in Northumberland-street, Strand. Madame Achilli was then absent, but came to town two or three days after. A person named Castellan was employed in the house at the time, and she remained there till late in the evening. I never took any liberties with either her or Jane Legge. I know her sister, Mrs. Logan. She did not send for me, but I had occasion to go to her house, where two of my friends were living. She told me that she was forced to accept the subpœna by a man who put into her hand a guinea.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you tell her if any man came there about it again to shut the door in his face?

Dr. Achilli.—She told me that the subpœna was put into her hand with violence, and I said that in the houses of England I did not believe violence could be offered.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did anything pass about your being intimate with her sister?

Dr. Achilli.—No; never. She never said anything of the kind to me. On

the contrary, she was sorry that the matter about her sister had been mooted at all.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Now, about Sarah Wood. Did you take any liberties with her?

Dr, Achilli.—No; never. I do not know her uncle.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Have you ever had any connexion with other women in England but these?

A juryman thought it an unfair question to put.

Lord Campbell.—The learned counsel has a right to put it.

Sir A. Cockburn.—I will put a specific case. Did you know a girl named Louisa Colchester?

Lord Campbell refused to allow this question.

Sir A. Cockburn.—When did you openly renounce Popery?

Dr. Achilli.—As soon as I reached Corfu I began to write letters to some cardinals and the Pope. I began to doubt the real presence at the mass when I was in Viterbo, as Professor of Philosophy, in 1832.

Sir A. Cockburn here read several passages from the writings of the witness on the errors of the mass, and then asked whether he did not, after believing it to be an imposition, practice the mass.

Dr. Achilli.—That would have held good as an objection to all the reformers. I had the persuasion of the imposition in my mind, but not in my heart. (Laughter.) I believe that conversion in man rests more in the heart than in the mind. (Sensation.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—Was it not made an objection to you that you did not attend the choir regularly?

Dr. Achilli.—No, never. I was, as Professor of Philosophy, not obliged to do so.

The re-examination by Sir F. Thesiger was a very brief one, and Dr. Achilli retired, having been in the witness-box from half-past nine to half-past four o'clock.

Dr. Domenico Poggi said—I was brought up in the church of Rome, and was a Dominican father. I am now principal of a Protestant educational establishment at Seacombe, near Liverpool. I was in Viterbo from the beginning of 1831 to June, 1833. I lived in the convent of Gradi when Dr. Achilli was sub-prior. I remember his preaching a sermon at Monte-fiasconi, at the request of the Princess of Saxony, whose confessor he was. Dr. Achilli was then universally and very highly esteemed. At Rome I never heard anything against him, but at Viterbo I did, for there he had many enemies. The monks and priests greatly esteemed him, but not the bishop. His appointment to preach the Lent sermons, to visit convents, and to be prior of the convent of St. Pretro the Martyr, at Naples, are great marks of distinction, and could only have been conferred on a man whose character for morality stood high. I took the vow of obedience as a Dominican, but always thought that though not explicitly, implicitly those of "poverty" and "chastity" were included. The book of *Ferrares* is one of authority, but there are things in it which have been obsolete.

Sir A. Cockburn—It would be an essential thing in your opinion for a Dominican to obey the vows of poverty and chastity?

Witness—Yes, except that I don't think he would be a Dominican long. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn—When did you leave the church?

Witness.—It is enough to say that I am a Protestant. I am happy to say that I am so now; but I do not come here to give an account of my life and actions. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—What can be the mystery? When did you first go to a Protestant church?

Witness.—I beg your pardon, Sir, but I must decline. I have not come here to answer on extraneous subjects. (Much laughter.) I left Italy in 1840.

Sir A. Cockburn.—At that time you had seceded?

Witness.—I had in my mind but I won't answer any more. (Laughter.)

Dominichi Paoli, formerly a friar of the order of Serviti at Viterbo, said: I lived in that town from the end of 1831 to near the end of 1837. I knew Dr. Achilli there. I have nothing to say against him, and I saw that he was then in public estimation. I know nothing of any alleged immoralities on the part of Dr. Achilli.

Cross-examined.—I am here a year, a free man, having left the Roman Catholic church. I came originally, engaged by a society to evangelize foreigners during the Great Exhibition. (Much laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—What society?

Witness.—It was a society that had an office in Leicester-square. I was at Geneva, and was called to England by that society. I have been severed from the communion of the Catholic church for two years, but I left Italy freely, in order to profess freely my religious opinions. I have known Dr. Achilli and treated him as an acquaintance. Between leaving Italy and going to Geneva I went here and there, wherever I was sent by my superior.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Who supports you now?

Witness.—I live on the means afforded by Father Gavazzi. I act as his secretary.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Is Father Gavazzi the man who, being formerly in the church of Rome, now goes about speaking against it?

Witness.—Yes.

Captain William Hudson Lawrence, R.A., on half-pay, Inspector-General of Police in the Ionian Islands, said: In consequence of an application from the solicitor for the prosecution in this case, I sent for a copy of the proceedings between Garamoni and his wife at Corfu. I was employed to find the wife of Garamoni, and she is now in this country. I also tried to find out Coriboni and his wife, but could get no information about them.

The Attorney-General.—What is the character of the witness Russo who has been brought over here?

Witness.—I only know it from documents at the police-office.

Mr. Kirkpatrick, for many years Chief Justice of the Ionian Islands, authenticated the proceedings in the civil and ecclesiastical courts of Corfu for alimony by Garamoni's wife. The papers gave no evidence of witnesses being examined. The case only proceeded a short way, for a reconciliation took place.

Sir A. Cockburn reminded the witness that the Italian word for reconciliation also meant compromise.

Mariania Crisaffi Garamoni, a very smartly-dressed person, but exceedingly plain-looking, said: I am the wife of Garamoni, a tailor, who carried on business at Corfu. I remember Dr. Achilli living next door to me and my mother there. My husband did not reside with us. I remember one night speaking to Dr. Achilli as he was passing. My husband used violence towards me many times, and many accusations have been made against him on that account. I wish I had him here. (Laughter.) My face has been disfigured by him. I wished to call Dr. Achilli because my mother pointed him out to me, and said that probably he, being a neighbour, had overheard the quarrel between me and a lady friend of my husband. I said to her that I would wait till the evening and ask him if he had heard it. I did so. I got to the window for the purpose of calling him, and as I was going down to speak to him my husband and Dr. Achilli rushed in together. I wished to call him that he might be a witness in my favour, but I did not know him. I should like my husband to be here; but he is not—he has run away. (Laughter.) He rushed up stairs on the occasion referred to, and said many things he ought not to say, because a cause was given in my favour. Dr. Achilli was outside of the door when my husband pushed him up to it. I know nothing of these calumnies. I know not who this Dr. Achilli is, and would not recognise him except that the daughter of the landlady where I now reside pointed him out to me.

Sir A. Cockburn.—There were proceedings in the court between you and your husband?

Witness.—Yes, and I came out victorious. (Laughter.) He wished that we

should make peace; I had forgiven him before a hundred times, and so I forgave him this also. We lived together some years, but now we are separated again, and have been for more than seven years

Cross-examined by Sir A. Cockburn.—I have been married about sixteen years, and my husband has always led me a miserable life.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did the quarrels not arise from his accusing you of being intimate with other men?

Witness.—No; it was I accused him. I always gave proofs of my innocence. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—Why did you bring forward such proofs unless you were accused?

Witness.—I was always beaten because he had to do with other women. (Laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—Was it not because he said you had to do with other men?

Witness.—No; there are many proofs of what I say—two doctors, four lawyers, and many other men. (Much laughter.) They will all prove that he is a bad man. (Continued laughter.)

Sir A. Cockburn.—How did you know that Dr. Achilli was out that you waited for him?

Witness.—My mother told me that he was not at home, and I said I will remain all night, if necessary, in order to see him.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you say anything to Dr. Achilli besides calling him?

Witness.—I did not even call him; but my intention was to call him for the purpose I have mentioned. (Sensation.) I was still up stairs with a light when they came to the door.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did your husband call you to bring the light?

Witness.—No; but I, wishing to go down and speak to the gentleman, brought it down.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did you hold it up to the gentleman's face?

Witness.—No; but I had it in my hand?

Sir A. Cockburn.—Did your husband say, "Worthless woman, I have caught you!"

Witness.—He tormented me, and the whole of that night he went about telling every one that he had caught me with this gentleman. (Laughter.) Two persons passed at the time, and my husband said to them, "See, I have caught my wife with this gentleman!" My husband held Dr. Achilli against the wall and insulted him in various ways.

Sir A. Cockburn.—How did he get loose?

Witness.—I don't know, for I was up stairs. I did not come to the door. I could not come. I was at the window. My mother is a laundress, and I was staying with her and my brothers before I was married. My mother has some landed property.

Mrs. Achilli, an English lady, who has been brought up in Italy, but speaks her own language well, and is young and rather comely in appearance, said: I was married at Rome in 1849. I met my husband in Paris after his escape from the Inquisition. I took a house in Shaftesbury-crescent, and had a servant named Harriet Harris, who was with me three months. I found the kitchen very dirty, and she said it was not a usual thing for English ladies to go there. I said I was not English; I have not the custom of the English ladies, and I will come when I like. She then gave me notice, but wanted to stay at the end of the month. I, however, would not allow her to stay. Jane Legge was also in my service. I came home one night at eleven o'clock, and found a young man in the back kitchen, and I ordered her to leave next day.

This concluded the evidence for the prosecution, and, it being half-past six o'clock, the Court adjourned.

FOURTH DAY.—Thursday, June 24th.

The hearing of this case was resumed to-day amid continued, and even greater, manifestations of public excitement and interest than have yet been displayed. The available space on either side of the justice seat was occupied by a succession of Lord Campbell's friends; the area of the court-room, the passages, and the galleries were crammed with barristers, attorneys, reporters, divines, Italian refugees, Papists, anti-Papists, and two or three adventurous ladies. Human faces might be seen dimly peering through obscure fanlights to obtain a glimpse, however imperfect, of what was going on, and altogether the proceedings of this remarkable case were conducted to a close amid an amount of interest now seldom witnessed in Westminster-hall, and which seemed to revive somewhat of the spirit of the olden times when Protestantism was still struggling for its ascendancy.

Sir Alexander Cockburn addressed the jury in reply to the prosecutor's evidence. He said: Gentlemen, the course which my learned friend the Attorney-General, on the part of Dr. Achilli, has adopted, of laying his evidence before you after that of the defence, entitles me to address you on the evidence which he has now adduced. And, in doing so, I hope I shall be able to throw some light on the statements from which you will have to form your conclusions as to the result at which you ought to arrive. Nevertheless, if you should have been influenced in any degree to form any opinion, you will listen, in the discharge of your duty, with attention and patience to the observations which I shall feel it necessary to make in discharge of mine. Gentlemen, this case has now assumed in my mind as possibly it has assumed in the mind of everybody, a deep and most painful interest. I have not, and cannot be expected to have, any religious sympathy with the defendant, but I have an interest in the case not only such as an advocate ought always to have for his client, but an interest that justice should be done; and I have, too, that additional interest in it which is derived from the peculiar form which this case has now assumed. The issue now presented for your decision has become complicated. You have no longer to decide simply the question, on the one hand, whether the defendant has only been guilty of publishing a libel, but with full means of justification, or whether, on the other hand, Dr Achilli has been foully and falsely assailed in his character by this libel; but you have to decide the question, which now for the first time has arisen, and which is not one of less deep and painful interest, namely, by whom gross, foul, deliberate perjury has been committed in the evidence which has been given in this case; for from that question you have no chance of escape. One or other has been guilty of gross and deliberate falsehood in the case. That question admits of no compromise. There is nothing by which the conflict of testimony can be reconciled; there can be no mere mistake; no misunderstanding; no misconception—one of the two parties has spoken the truth, or has been guilty of wilful and deliberate perjury. The woman who came forward to state that Dr. Achilli was the man who robbed her of her virtue cannot be mistaken. No woman, whatever the lapse of time, forgets the man by whom she was initiated into the secrets and mysteries of life. And though I can conceive it to be possible that a licentious libertine, in the number of his victims, may forget the individuality of one of them, still, where time, place, and circumstance are brought clearly to his recollection, and the individual herself is again presented to his sight, there can be no mistake on his part. It is not possible that even in the generality of his intercourse with women a particular case should not at once present itself to his mind when under such circumstances the victim of his licentiousness is presented before him. Therefore it is that I say that one or other of these parties has been guilty of foul and deliberate perjury. The woman who swore that Achilli had seduced her from the paths of virtue, the mother who swore to having assailed him as the guilty cause of the ruin of her child, spoke the truth or wickedly invented a story, which they came to tell on this occasion. On which side lies the truth? That is the question which you

have to determine; and in order that you should determine it rightly, and in so determining it do justice, you must bring to the consideration of the case impartial and dispassionate minds, not assuming, till you have carefully considered and weighed all the circumstances, that the truth is on the one side or on the other. I shall now, gentlemen, pass in review the evidence we laid before you, and, on the other hand, contrast it with the evidence adduced on the part of the prosecution. If you believe the witnesses whose testimony has been presented to you on behalf of Dr. Newman, you must find your verdict in his favour; if you believe that the witnesses produced by Achilli, and Achilli himself, are not perjured then undoubtedly the accusation against him is unfounded, and Dr. Newman is without defence. On which side, I repeat, lies the truth? Do the witnesses I have called declare the truth, or is Achilli to be believed when he asserts that all that they have stated is false? Many attempts will be made to prejudice your minds in deciding this question. Every topic which the great ingenuity of my learned friend can suggest, or which prejudice can possibly adopt, will be put forward, and put forward by my learned friend with all the force of the eloquence which belongs to him. He will follow me—that is an advantage. He has, in addition to that, another advantage over me—the advantage of answering instead of being answered, and the still greater advantage that he has to address those who, unless a rigid sense of impartiality interposes between them and the impulses of their hearts and the suggestions of their feelings, must offer a congenial auditory to the observations he will make. Nevertheless, I despair not in what I believe to be the truth; and I shall proceed to compare the evidence on both sides, and to point out to you as I go on what seem to me the strong and cogent grounds for your giving your credit to the witnesses for the defendant. With these preliminary observations I proceed to the case itself, and confine myself to those matters which are really worthy of your consideration. I shall follow the case through the different events of the life of Dr. Achilli, and the charges which attach themselves to him at various epochs of his career. He was educated as a Jesuit; he became a monk; he passed a portion of his life at Viterbo; thence he removed to Rome. A short time afterwards he went to Capua; from Capua he went to Naples; then again to Rome, where proceedings were taken against him before the Inquisition; then he went to Corfu, thence to Malta, and then to England. Each of these residences forms a feature in the history of his life, and I will follow him through all. I called a witness from Viterbo, who stated that he was the cause of her seduction. Is that to be believed? She appeared to tell her tale in an artless manner. She had not the advantage of a Jesuitical education, nor of a mind trained in the subtleties of casuistry and metaphysics. She told a plain tale. She said that she was a servant in a country house; that Achilli was then on a visit there; that he induced her to walk out, and made attempts upon her. He induced her to go to his convent, where she might naturally have supposed that she was under the protection of the sacredness of the place, but where he availed himself of the opportunity to debauch her. This evidence is most important, if true. Is it true? What doubt can be set against it? It is clear, from Achilli's evidence, that he has had the opportunity to investigate the past life of this woman. Since the period in question many years have elapsed. He states that he has carefully watched the movements of his enemies; yet he knows nothing against Elena Valente though he knew that she was a woman through whom it was intended to disclose these charges against himself. The plea disclosed to him the name of this particular individual; yet with all his watching there is not one word of imputation uttered against her character. I take it, therefore, that she is blameless, with the exception of this guilty transaction, in which she was misled by Achilli himself. But then it will be said that she was under the influence of the priests; and that she was told that the glory of God would be served by her coming forward to state these matters, the object of the priests being really to put down Achilli. You will, perhaps, be reminded of the Jesuits, and of the maxim attributed to the Roman Catholic Church, that pious frauds are excusable, and that you are justified in attaining sacred ends even by unholy means. Such a topic is a two-edged

sword, it cuts two ways at once. You may be told of Italian perfidy, and how little Italian statements are to be relied on. Again I say this is a two-edged sword, and may cut him who wields it. For, who and what is Achilli, on whose oath these witnesses are to be convicted of perjury? Is he not an Italian—was he not educated by Jesuits—was he not initiated into all the corruptions and artifices which are, whether rightly or wrongly, ascribed to that well-known community? When these things are talked of it is not to be forgotten that Achilli was educated and trained to subtle disputes and ingenious casuistry—that he was brought up among monks, was a friar, and a priest, and is himself an Italian. I am not guilty of saying that you should judge by such rules, but I do say that if such rules of judgment are suggested for your adoption, you will recollect that they apply with great force to Achilli, and that they do not apply to the witnesses I have presented to you; and, indeed, I cannot help thinking that if, instead of in the ordinary civil garb of a Protestant he had appeared in a monk's costume, it would have struck many of us that the man and the habit were by no means ill suited the one to the other. And if you are to be urged to discredit the defendant's witnesses because they are under the influence of the priests, I must tell you that the witness for the prosecution is an Italian, a Jesuit, a monk, and a priest. I claim for my simple peasants, unless you should see in extrinsic or intrinsic circumstances reasons to disbelieve them, at least as much credit as he can pretend to be entitled to. What interest had these women to come here to proclaim their disgrace! Was it that the confessor had told them it would be for the glory of God and the Church? or does any one suppose that Dr. Newman suborned this testimony to protect himself against this information, to effect which purpose he is ready to lay the guilt of perjury on his soul? Who supposes such a monstrous absurdity? Many of us differ from him, and we may regret his falling off from the faith in which he was born; but we all know him to be in character free from the possibility of such an imputation, free from anything which could injuriously affect his honour, morality, or integrity. Then what interest have these people to tell anything but the truth? But is there not an interest on the other side? Ask yourselves for a moment. Consider the situation in which Achilli stands. Everything he has in the world is at stake—I concede it; and my learned friend will on that ground make an appeal to your sympathy, which he will clothe in most beautiful language. But some things, at least, are clear. Whether by his own act, or by the act of the Roman Catholic Church, he is no longer a member of it, he has been driven from it. From all hope of emolument, preferment, profit, and dignity, in that Church, he has been cut off for ever. His hope of maintainance, his means of existence in this country, depend on his position as a Protestant teacher and preacher, and on the opinion adopted of him by a particular body of proselytes from the Roman Catholic Church, by whom he is looked on as a great and shining light. To his success in this respect his character is absolutely essential; and surely this is a circumstance which is deserving of your serious attention, before you come to the conclusion that what he swears is true, and that the witnesses who contradict him are false. I have made these observations on the first witness whom I presented, but they are applicable to all the rest; nor can any one doubt that if interest can be held to give a bias to testimony, Achilli's interest on this occasion is of the most potent kind. There was one circumstance connected with the story of Elena Valente, which strongly tends to show the unscrupulous character of the man whose veracity is now in question. He was prepared to have the woman called before him. She is brought. He swears that he has never before seen her. It was stated that he had seen and corrupted her at a country-house of a family named Gentili. You remember how he denied that he visited any country-house of the Gentili's. He visited only the houses of three relatives, the names of two of whom are immaterial, but the third was Christoferi. Why it turned out that Madame Christoferi, who was a widow, was by birth a Gentili, and was, according to a custom very prevalent in Italy, as often called by the name of her own family as by that of her late husband. Of this we had many instances, and the custom is perfectly well known; but what think you of the denial of the fact, when he must have known, and did know,

that the house meant was really the house at which he visited? This shows you the subtlety and casuistry you have to deal with when you are dealing with his evidence, and must put you on your guard against him. We come next to the case at Naples, that of the woman Principe. According to her statement he saw her going to church for the purpose of paying a contribution to an association formed in honour of the Virgin Mary. He beckoned her into the church, he got her into the sacristy, and there he had criminal intercourse with her. He denied the charge; but it is not claar that he was accused of it at the time, and that though an ecclesiastic, and with all the privileges of one, he was challenged with his offence in a public procession, and that it was made the subject of inquiry at the police? It is clear that there was such an association as that of which she spoke; it is clear that the matter was the subject of inquiry; and though his agents have had the opportunity of going to Naples, not a word of imputation, beyond this offence itself, is cast upon the family. And not till the scandal had become public was one word said by him on the matter, and then he caused the father of the girl to be summoned before the police, and the commissary of police made inquiries; and though in Italy everything was subservient to the Church, no punishment was visited on these poor people for having charged a member of the Church with a great and scandalous offence. Then comes the case of Garimoni, at Corfu. Achilli is charged with an improper intimacy with the wife of Garimoni. The charge is met by the denial of Achilli, and the evidence of the wife of Garimoni. But is it not clear that that charge is well founded? The learned counsel here went through the circumstances of that case, and insisted strongly on the contradictions apparent between the tale as told by Achilli himself and as detailed by Madame Garamoni—contradictions which, he contended, rendered their testimony valueless. Now, gentlemen, I will pass on to the next case that occurred at Zante, and if the balance of testimony does not apply in my favour, then I acknowledge that I altogether misapprehend what is the value of the testimony given. It seems that before Dr. Achilli left Corfu, he engaged in his service two persons named Coriboni, man and wife. Now Dr. Achilli could not have been unaware that there had been serious imputations made upon him as a moral man, imputations which, whether well or ill founded, is beside my immediate purpose to inquire; but Dr. Achilli knew that thousands upon thousands of accusations had been made against him. Unfortunate man, he has gone through a long career of innocence and purity; but somehow or other it has happened that charges have been, from envious, wicked, designing persons, promulgated against his character. Certainly it behoved such a man to walk scrupulously, but before he left Corfu he engaged Coriboni and his wife. What were they? Coriboni had been a small trader, but that failing he became a chorus singer—none of his wares, nothing was left him but his voice. Yes, besides his voice he had a wife, an attractive wife. To be sure Dr. Achilli represents her as not very well favoured, nor the reverse; but, however, I suppose she sought to make up a deficiency in the appearance of her charms by a little display of that which, she thought, might be more attractive. This Madame Coriboni, according to the evidence of several witnesses, was a person of very light estimation. She is represented to have been an absolute prostitute, her husband living upon the wages of her infamy and shame. Even supposing there were somewhat of exaggeration in this representation, I think there cannot be the slightest doubt that Coriboni was one who did not hesitate to add, by her means, to the receipts he obtained in his occupation of a chorus singer. Dr. Achilli took these two persons into his service, and without the slightest inquiry as to who or what they were. Coriboni had a fair wife, who was very likely to make herself a very convenient addition to his family. If he had made an inquiry, he would have found she was not a person fitting for a holy man to take into his own house. He did no such thing. Having arrived at Zante, Coriboni, to his utter astonishment, found himself installed as clerk in a Protestant chapel. Like Shakspeare's history of man, "he had performed many parts." Sometimes he was a trader, sometimes a soldier, at other times the priest of Iris. Conceive the astonishment

of Coriboni at being suddenly converted into a clerk in a Protestant church. He had not got through his chrysalis state. I should describe him as still in the grub position, looking to the bread and cheese. He had no great objection to becoming a Protestant clerk. He had never thought of the Protestant religion; but anything for an honest livelihood, something like Dr. Achilli himself. It is something like the distinction Dr. Achilli sets up between the religion of the head and the heart. There is a religion of the understanding and of reason, and there is a religion of the heart; but to form a religion one must be in unison with the other, or it is only a form of religion. When a man turns from the Roman Catholic Church and becomes a Protestant he is caught up by those who are weak enough to believe that every person who professes to be a convert becomes so for conscience sake, although it may be done from the most sordid motive. Take a specimen of this gentleman, who professes to have regard to the errors of Popery, and being disputed with then comes into the British dominions and establishes a Protestant church, and takes a Roman Catholic chorus singer, who is to perform a part in the sacred office in the ministry. This shows the motives of Dr. Achilli. He became intimate with Mr. Reynolds, who came forward to support this chapel, and the first time he goes to chapel he sees Coriboni officiating as a clerk, and the doors opened by his wife. Mr. Reynolds, anxious that everything should be done with a due regard to the decency which ought to be observed, is surprised to see a common woman, who had pursued the course of a prostitute with the knowledge of her husband, acting in the chapel, remonstrated with Dr. Achilli upon the impropriety of such a course. What says Dr. Achilli? Oh, no; it is indifferent to me; it is enough for me if they behave well in my house. You may say it is part of the Christian duty to extend the hand of charity and kind assistance to a repentant woman; but you do not place an abandoned woman in a situation in a chapel; it would be a stumbling-block to the various persons who came there. Such was the view of Mr. Reynolds. But Mr. Reynolds is met by a flat denial on the part of Dr. Achilli, who says Mr. Reynolds never did make any remonstrance, and that Coriboni continued to act as clerk to the end, and that his congregation increased. Mr. Reynolds says he saw from the upper window of his house indecent familiarities going on between Dr. Achilli and his servant that were altogether outrageous. They were seen by a female member of his family. He thought it necessary to remonstrate with him on the scandal he was bringing on the new establishment. He answered he should keep what servants he pleased; and on the third time of speaking to him he became in a passion, and the result was Mr. Reynolds withdrew from the congregation, and the whole thing fell to the ground. Now he is contradicted point blank by Dr. Achilli, who says he never remonstrated about these persons serving in the chapel, until after he had found it necessary to reproach him for habitual drunkenness, when he opened upon him with these remonstrances about the employment of these two people. Now, gentlemen, this is oath against oath. There can be no doubt of this, that Dr. Achilli has a very strong reason for making out his case. Mr. Reynolds does not, so far as we can see, labour under any sense of interest to induce him to swear to those things which are untrue. Has he invented these conversations? are they unlikely to have happened? But then you have the young girl, now a nursery governess. She is without an imputation; she is not an Italian; she is not a Roman Catholic, and cannot have any interest. The learned counsel then commented upon the evidence at very great length, and said, I trust you will decide according to your judgment, and not be led away by fanaticism and bigotry. I care not on which side it may be exhibited—whether by Protestants or Roman Catholics. Hold the scales of justice even, though your hands may shake with the strength of religious passion. He said, in one part, Gentlemen, I appeal to your sense of justice, to your feelings as men; and, as Christians, I ask you to look upon these things with a resolution that, however great and true religious faith and zeal may be, yet justice is one of the early born and dearest emanations from God and religion (loud cheers).

Lord Campbell said there must not be such exhibitions.

Sir A. Cockburn, after some observations on the case of Catherine Gorman, remarked on the authority which ought to be attached to the judgment of the Inquisition at Rome.

Lord Campbell said that he had examined that document, and though he did not regret having admitted it in evidence, he must remark that the first portion of it merely stated the result to which the notary who drew it up had come. It was not a formal judgment, but he had admitted it for the purpose of having any evidence which might throw light on the issues.

Sir A. Cockburn said that the document purported to be founded on certain accusations made against Dr. Achilli, for incontinence, some of which, he submitted, had been proved in the present inquiry. Now Dr. Achilli had said that no such charges had been brought before the Italian Court, and asserted, in proof of his statement, that the Inquisition had not jurisdiction in matters of alleged immorality, but only in matters of faith. Dr. Grant had, however, proved the contrary to be the fact; and this document proved Dr. Grant's statement to be true. The document sentenced Dr. Achilli for his immoralities.

Lord Campbell said that the adjudicating part did not set out the offence for which the sentence was passed.

Sir A. Cockburn observed, that this was the first time in which a judgment of the Inquisition had ever been brought forward in a trial in this country; and though it was not drawn with the formality of English judgments, it stated that Dr. Achilli confessed his immoralities, and threw himself on the mercy of the court. Dr. Achilli had said that he never was suspended from his functions, and that no charge but for false doctrine was ever made against him. This document disproved both his statements. Let not the jury be prejudiced against the Inquisition, for this was not the Spanish Inquisition, to which so many atrocities had been attributed. The learned counsel then commented severely on Dr. Achilli's refusal to answer many of the questions put to him with regard to instances of alleged immorality, although his professed object in coming into court was to vindicate his character. Is it possible that any man can for a single moment shut his eyes to the importance of such questions in determining, in a particular instance, whether a man has committed an act of carnal intercourse with a particular individual? When that individual comes forward and says, "I swear to the fact," and the person charged says, "I swear to a denial," how are you to determine between them? Is it not legitimate to inquire of that man, What are your general habits of conduct?—you, who were a monk and a priest, and had in that capacity taken an oath which implies the rigorous observance of chastity. Surely the fact that a man is in the habitual practice of breaking that vow, and transgressing that obligation, must be an element in the general consideration whether the witness is to be believed who said that he did it, or he who says that that witness has committed perjury against him. Undoubtedly a man has a right to say, "I shelter myself under my privilege,—I am not bound to blacken myself." Be it so; but your silence is equivalent to all you could say, and a great deal more. If you come here to clear your character, what matters it whether you committed an act of fornication with A, B, C, D, or E? How comparatively unimportant is a single isolated instance, as compared with the habitual course of your conduct. Now, gentlemen, I think I have gone through the whole of this case. I can only ask you, in conclusion, to bring to its consideration calm and impartial minds. It must be admitted on all hands, that, if the matters which have been alleged against Dr. Achilli by Dr. Newman be true, Dr. Newman was justified in calling attention to the character of the witness who was thus impeaching the truth of the Catholic doctrine, and the purity of the Catholic religion, and denouncing the licentiousness, and impurities, and dissolute lives, as well as the erroneous doctrines, of the priests of the Roman Catholic Church, and denouncing these, too, as matters within his own personal knowledge. You have a right and are justified in inquiring, for the public interests and the welfare of mankind are involved in it, into the conduct of the accuser and witness. That is what Dr. Newman has done; but he was not the first who did it. From his own book I have the fact, that, in the *Dublin Review*, there had been published an article

"raking up," to use his own expression, every circumstance that could be adduced against him. I should like to know why that was allowed to sleep unvisited by any legal proceedings on the part of Dr. Achilli; and why it was only when the charges were a second time repeated that Dr. Achilli came forward, months after the first accusation? Why is this? Because, when these matters came to be thus repeated, and brought under the public attention, no doubt those under whose fostering protection Dr. Achilli had ministered in this country, and who are bringing him forward as a striking and memorable instance of a great conversion from the antagonist Church, believing that if these imputations upon his character rested unanswered, his usefulness would be entirely destroyed, have called upon him to come forward and vindicate himself from these aspersions. His everything, his all, his very existence almost is at stake in this cause; and while that, on the one hand, should induce you to give the best consideration to his case, on the other it should put you on your guard not to place implicit credence on its testimony, when it is in irreconcileable opposition to that of numerous witnesses. I ask you to take these matters into your calm and dispassionate consideration. I know the difficulty of your doing so. I have felt from the beginning the disadvantageous ground on which I was placed in maintaining the defence of Dr. Newman. We have here two great champions of these opposing doctrines,—both of them converts from the faith in which they were bred,—both of them coming forward now to assert and maintain the truth and excellence of the Church which they have joined; and I am pleading for the Catholic before a Protestant jury. I cannot but feel how difficult this is in such times as these, when we have had the spirit of proselytism again rekindled, after it has long slept and slumbered,—when the Catholic, with upraised Cross, and the Protestant, with open Bible, have entered into the arena for the dominion over the consciences of mankind. God prosper the truth, say I. We have an interest, from the natural feeling and bias of our minds, in the religion to which we belong, and in favour of the success and triumph of one of these two principles. Our feelings on these points have recently been kindled afresh, with an energy of which, perhaps, we had no notion in our times, from the conflict which has unhappily arisen. And with these feelings yet fresh in our minds, we have, in a case like the present, where these religious dissensions seem to have at last become concentrated in one focus, to decide between these conflicting champions. Forgive me for feeling the difficult and dangerous circumstances in which my client is placed. I cannot shut my eyes to the manner in which your own good and excellent feelings upon the subject of religion may, in this case, bias your understandings in determining this question. These halls, in which this inquiry is now taking place, have not to-day, for the first time, witnessed the miscarriage of justice in the cases of religious quarrels; there remain, unhappily for our fame, upon the pages of history, some unfortunate transactions which have taken place in this great hall, which is associated, I grieve to say, with the dark, as well as with the more glorious, epochs of our history. Here, then, have taken place judicial proceedings over which the historian would gladly draw an impenetrable veil, were it not that history, by holding up its beacon-light over the errors of the past, should warn us against the evils of the future; and though the days, thank God, are now past, when human life was sacrificed to religious bigotry and passion, yet there have been times when juries,—aye, juries, taken from the intelligent community of this city,—and (I grieve to say it) when even judges have lent themselves to judicial murders, for they were neither more nor less, on the score of religious zeal. These are, indeed, different times; and this is a trifling cause, compared with those. But that same feeling which then deadened men's feelings and consciences to the higher motives by which they should have been guided and directed, may, in a minor matter like this, creep with that insensible subtlety with which they do creep around men's minds and understandings, and may shut your eyes to the sight of truth, and your minds to the light of reason, and may induce you not to bring to this case that calm and dispassionate consideration which you would bring to any other case in which you had no object but to discharge the sacred duty entrusted to you. I ask you to give the case a

calm and dispassionate consideration; and, if you do so, I entertain the strongest confidence that your verdict will be in my favour. [A burst of applause greeted the learned counsel as he resumed his seat, after speaking for about three hours and a half.]

Lord Campbell said, that he thought that it was better now to come to an understanding as to the questions to be left to the jury. This plea, technically, is one plea, pleaded to the whole of the alleged libel; but it contains twenty-three charges, and he thought that, for the ends of justice, it would be very material that these several matters should be left separately to the jury. He would suggest that the jury should have a copy of the different allegations in the plea, and that they should say whether they believed, upon the evidence of the whole, these charges were made out, or any part of them, or none of them. He would adopt that course if the counsel on both sides were satisfied that it was the proper course.

The Attorney-General said, that he was perfectly satisfied that this course should be adopted.

His lordship and the jury then retired for a few minutes. On their return,

The Attorney-General replied, and after referring to the eloquent and impassioned speech which Sir A. Cockburn had addressed to the jury, reminded them that that speech was delivered before any observations had been made by Dr. Achilli's counsel on the accusations against him. All that the most bitter hatred, unbounded industry, and unlimited means could do to destroy a man, had been accumulated together, and it would be for the jury to say if the evidence was enough to crush the prosecutor, or if it crumbled itself at the touch of impartial truth. The trial was unprecedented, for the case resolved itself into charges in which Dr. Achilli, though nominally the prosecutor, stood before them as the accused. There was a privilege admitted in every court of justice in the country which had been studiously taken from Dr. Achilli. He had been removed at an early stage from the court, and had been prevented confronting the witnesses against him, and he (the Attorney-General) could only think that, his learned friends having been engaged in the examination of the proceedings of the Inquisition, had determined that in the present action the Roman form should prevail in a British court of justice. He asked the jury whether anything but a consciousness of innocence could have supported Dr. Achilli during his long examination yesterday? His learned friend regretted that the flames of religious bigotry had been excited in the country, and he had warned the jury in very strong language not to be carried away by it; but he (the Attorney-General) should be ashamed of appealing to such grounds. All that Dr. Achilli said in the contest between him and Dr. Newman was,—"You, Dr. Newman, have made use of poisoned arrows; and if you cannot justify your conduct, you must be convicted as a slanderer." We could only judge of men by their conduct; and, when there were these vehement attacks by Dr. Newman, we could only attribute them to that feeling of hatred which did not require any personal knowledge of the individual. Dr. Newman had shown all the zeal of a convert against Dr. Achilli, who was a distinguished convert on the other side, and hence the malice displayed by the former. It was said that Dr. Wiseman had attacked Dr. Achilli in the *Dublin Review*. If Dr. Wiseman had chosen to throw off his mask, Dr. Achilli would have joined issue with him; but he did not; and it was only for the first time that he discovered in Dr. Newman an adversary who was visible, and whom he might encounter in the light of day. They were both now before the jury, Dr. Newman undertaking to justify the 23 charges contained in the plea of justification. Had the charges been brought against Dr. Achilli directly he would be in a much more advantageous position than he was in at present. He had to answer for 26 years of his life, and to answer 23 charges; yet notwithstanding these disadvantages, and the powerful addresses of his learned friend, he (the Attorney-General) felt confident that, without prejudice, and in the strict exercise of an impartial desire to do justice, the jury would be enabled to come to the conclusion that Dr. Achilli was entitled to their verdict. He thought it right, in the first instance, to bring their attention to charges on the record of which there was not the slightest

proof. It was alleged, in the seventh charge, that Dr. Achilli, on the 1st of February, 1831, debauched and carnally knew Rosa de Alessandris, and in September, 1833, was found guilty by the Bishop of Viterbo. In the 12th charge this is alleged to have been committed in the sacristy of the church of St. Gradi, Viterbo, and in the 20th charge he is alleged to have given 50 scudi to the father of Rosa de Alessandria as hush-money. Now, no evidence had been given on this subject for the defendant; but Dr. Achilli had stated that he had a relation, a nun, of that name—that her father died when he was a child—that he had never had such an accusation brought against him, and that the whole was untrue. It had been said that the papers of the police-court in Viterbo had been burnt during the revolution; but this was not a police case. Then he came to the 8th charge, in which it was alleged that in July, 1834, Dr. Achilli debauched another woman, whose name was unknown; but who nevertheless, it was said, was chaste and unmarried. (Laughter.) But the jury had it in evidence that the greater part of that year he was on a tour of visitation, with time and place given, and means of contradiction, which, had proof been attempted, would have been incontrovertible. Then there was the 9th charge, which set forth that in 1835 Dr. Achilli had debauched Vincenza Guerra at Viterbo. Now, in 1835 Dr. Achilli never was in Viterbo, but preached the Lent sermon that year and remained at Capua. It was said that he had been convicted of these things before the Inquisition, whereas the fact was that he had never been within miles of the place. The 13th charge was that in 1841, at Rome, Naples, and Malta, Dr. Achilli spoke against the Eucharist and chastity, and by this had corrupted various persons. Then, some persons who it was said had been debauched in 1831 appeared as again led astray by the preaching and teaching of Dr. Achilli in 1841. The 21st charge set forth that by an official document in the archives of the police-court at Naples Dr. Achilli had been convicted of habitual incontinence. In support of this charge he thought his oponents would have gone to the fountain head; but a document was produced, of the authenticity of which no evidence had been given, and which, therefore, his Lordship had excluded. Upon the charges he had mentioned no evidence had been given; and, with reference to them, Dr. Newman must be found guilty; but on the others also, on which evidence had been given, he trusted to show that they had not been substantiated. Dr. Newman alleged that Dr. Achilli was an infidel; in other words, that he denied the Scriptures and the divine origin of the Christian religion. Dr. Achilli had never been an infidel in that sense; but, if it was meant to make him out so because he did not believe in transubstantiation or in auricular confession, or in absolution, he (the Attorney-General), without the slightest levity, hoped that the number of such infidels might be daily increased, (Applause.) Dr. Achilli was then charged as a hypocrite, and in support of this passages in his own book had been referred to. The passages so quoted illustrated the struggles of a strong mind with its doubts. A reference was made to Luther, and they all remembered how his mind was bent and bowed down from year to year, and yet could any one say that because Luther had remained in the church in which he had been born and brought up until his doubts had ripened into conviction, therefore he was a hypocrite? Did Dr. Newman lie down believing in the errors of Roman Catholicism one night, and get up next morning a full-blown Roman Catholic? (Laughter.) It was alleged in charge 4 that Dr. Achilli, as early as 1826, was deprived of his faculty to lecture. Now, the only lectureship he obtained in Viterbo was in 1827; yet he was in 1826 accused of being deprived of his lectureship for an offence which his superiors wished to conceal. He continued in that lectureship till 1833; and here the jury had an example of the rashness with which the charges against him had been made. The 5th charge was, that in 1827 Dr. Achilli had already earned the reputation of a scandalous friar. It was said, "Slander well, and some of it is sure to stick." Yet two monks at Viterbo had been called, and had sworn that Dr. Achilli held a high reputation at the period referred to; and this character had been proved to have been maintained by him for ten years after. It was established that he was employed in offices of trust, as, for example, to confess persons of both sexes;

that in 1835 he was sent as visitor to the convent of Nessi; that when at Rome he preached the Lent sermons; that at Naples he was sent for to preach before the Duchess of Saxony; and that in 1837 he was appointed Prior of the Dominican Convent. Could the jury believe, with such evidence before them then, that in 1827 he was a friar of scandalous reputation? Could they think so with the fact that in 1835 he obtained his letters of secularization, which in 1839 were completed? He now came to the sixth charge, respecting Elena Valenti, dated on the 1st of February, 1831. There had been some intimation of the interest felt in Roman Catholic countries in this inquiry, that great facilities were given to persons seeking evideuce, and that a Roman Catholic solicitor of great respectability was in communication with a personage high in the Romish church, whose name he wished to communicate privately to his Lordship. Why this mystery in respect of pleas to be made the subject of a judicial inquiry? Was Mr. Harting afraid that it was coming too near the precincts of the Vatican, that in the highest quarters in the Romish church so great an interest was taken in this question? The jury would remember this in dealing with the facts, and estimating the truthfulness of the evidence adduced. Elena Valenti, who had been sent over to this country for the glory of God and the honour of holy mother church, had concealed the substance of her evidence for 20 years from all but her confessor; yet her curate, who could have known nothing of the matter, was found advising her on such grounds to come over. In judging between the witnesses he reminded the jury that those on the other side were Italians, who returned to their native country when the inquiry was over, uninfluenced by public opinion, and likely, even if they failed in the truth, for the honour of the church and glory of God, to obtain a very easy absolution. Dr. Achilli, on the other hand, was bound to England, was shut out from Roman Catholic countries, and was therefore in a position to be much more relied on. Valenti and the Principes were living together; they had compared notes; and now let him refer to a curious coincidence in the evidence which they gave. The offence to the girl Principe was said to have occurred on Good Friday. In the plea of justification no allusion was made to the offence taking place in the sacristy, but when the two witnesses came here they both said so. Dr. Achilli came into court to meet the charges against him. He was ready to answer on each charge, but was pressed whether he had not been incontinent with other women. Dr. Achilli had availed himself of the privilege of the law; but was man to be denied the justice which the law allowed him because at any period of life he might have forgotten those rules of morality which were obligatory on all? If such a question were put to the wisest and best among us, we should find it very difficult to answer in the affirmative, with truth, and according to conscience. If Dr. Achilli had come determine to deny everything, what prevented his contradicting the notion that he had ever sinned? How could his credit be impeached thereby, except from our knowledge of human nature, and our knowledge of the operation of that law of celibacy which prevailed in the Roman church? He asked the jury whether the withholding that denial did not add to the credit of Dr. Achilli's testimony in other respects. Elena Valenti gave no dates, and his learned friend said dates were not material, and he was technically right, but whether he was morally so was a different question. If Valenti had not mentioned the brothers of her mistress, there would have been a good deal in the observations of Sir A. Cockburn on that subject, but she had described them as Gentili, and not Christophili. Dr. Achilli denied ever having the slightest intimacy with Valenti, and during the 20 years that had since elapsed not a word was said on the subject. There was a most remarkable addition made by this woman to her story. A chymist, she said, came to her and told her what had been done to her by Dr. Achilli for the achievement of his own purposes; yet Dr. Dr. Achilli had not only kept his reputation, but had advanced grade by grade in the church. This was the only case made out against Dr Achilli at Viterbo, though he was charged with five others. The observations which he had made as to Elena Valenti applied also to Maria Principe; but there was another point to which he wished to draw the attention of the jury. Charge 11 stated that

Dr. Achilli had debauched a child aged 15, and charge 12 alleged that it took place on Good Friday. Good Friday of 1840 might have been an occasion on which Dr. Achilli's memory might fasten, and therefore Maria Principe said that the act took place in November or December, and that the child was born in October. Again, when Mrs. Principe was examined as to her age, she said she was fifty-nine, and twenty-five when Maria was born. It might, therefore, have been in 1818. It was in 1840 the offence took place; and, so far from Maria being fourteen or fifteen at that time, she must have been twenty-two. Again, this criminal intercourse took place in the sacristy, according to the girl Principe, whereas in the plea it was merely stated to have taken place on Good Friday. But this was not all. In her examination, Principe spoke of only one occasion on which intercourse took place. The cross-examination proceeded on that footing, yet, when re-examined the next day, she came and stated that carnal intercourse took place seven or eight times. How had she not stated this important fact previously, and how could the jury place confidence in such testimony? Anything more hard or cruel than the course adopted by the opposing counsel with reference to the applications made by the friends of Dr. Achilli to the police at Naples could hardly be imagined. Proceeding to Corfu, he came to charge 14, in which it was asserted that Dr. Achilli committed adultery with the wives of Garimoni and Coriboni. Anything short of the entire proof of these charges was a great failure of evidence, and he contended that that had been the case. No witnesses were brought by Dr. Achilli from Italy, for obvious reasons, but there were some from Corfu. Captain Lawrence came over; he was well known to Garimoni, and Garimoni was well known to Captain Lawrence; and, as soon as the latter arrived in this country, the former left, and could not be prevailed on to return. (Laughter.) Coriboni and his wife had left the island, and could not be traced. He recited the facts adduced to prove the charge of adultery, and contended that the discrepancies pointed out by Sir A. Cockburn did not materially affect the truth of the evidence given on behalf of and by Dr. Achilli. The Attorney-General then proceeded to dilate upon the improbabilities of the testimony given by Mr. Reynolds, and his nursery governess, which, if true, would go to establish the most unblushing effrontery on the part of Dr. Achilli. He did not impute perjury to the young woman Lavanchi, but she might have mistaken Dr. Achilli for Coriboni. The appointment of Dr. Achilli to the professorship at Malta College by the London Committee was an answer to all the slanders of Mr. Reynolds, whose evidence, whatever it was worth, completely failed in establishing the crime of adultery. He now came to charge 15, and the circumstances connected with Malta College, and contended that, while the plea of justification alleged that Dr. Achilli was mixed up in the accusations against Leonini and Saccares, no evidence had been given thereof. On the contrary, it was shown Dr. Achilli was in London at the time, and he was therefore neither involved in those accusations, nor had been dismissed from his professorship on that account.

Lord Campbell suggested that the Earl of Shaftesbury might be sent for and examined on that point, and accordingly his Lordship appeared and was examined from the bench.

Sir A. Cockburn.—Were there any other reasons besides that of having sen Saccares away which influenced the committee in dismissing Dr. Achilli?

The Earl of Shaftesbury (with much emphasis).—Yes; the other reasons were as follows:—We felt that if this matter became public, so great and foul a scandal would be created in the college, and in the branch of it occupied by the ex-priests, that, out of regard for the character of the institution and of Protestantism, we ought to cut the Gordian knot by getting rid of that portion of the establishment and dismissing Dr. Achilli, whether he was innocent or not. (Sensation.)

The Attorney-General felt under the greatest obligation to his Lordship for thus ascertaining the entire truth, because there could be no doubt now of the grounds on which Dr. Achilli was removed. So far from making out the charge against the conduct of Dr. Achilli, it had entirely failed, and the matter

was set at rest for ever. As to the cases of alleged adultery in England, and the charges founded on them, it appeared that as time ran on the witnesses became stronger and stronger in their accusations, until the whole ripened into a statement to which it was impossible to add. In none of these instances was a complaint made to Dr. Achilli or his wife; and, as to the testimony of Jane Legge, the fact that the Legislature required, in cases of affiliation, corroborative evidence proved how easily such evidence was got up, and how difficult it was to be rebutted. Two of the witnesses were admitted to be bad characters, and on no occasion did Dr. Achilli appear to have done anything to stifle the facts. Sarah Wood had mentioned that Dr. Achilli had given her a religious book; why was that book not produced? Assuming the fact stated by Catherine Gorman to be true, it amounted to nothing; and it appeared that, though Dr. Achilli had been there for months subsequently, nothing had occurred. He now came, in the last place, to that most extraordinary document which emanated from the Holy Inquisition. He quite agreed in the propriety of admitting that document *valeat quantum*, for there was a plea that Dr. Achilli had been pronounced guilty by the Inquisition, and that punishment had been awarded him. It was the first time that such a judgment had been put in evidence in this country, and he trusted that it would be the last. In 1831 Mr. Harting went to Rome, and, in some way or other, a person whom Mr. Harting wished to shroud in mystery interfered, and obtained the judgment. This was Monsignore Talbot, the Pope's secretary; and Mr. Harting thought it would be prejudicial to the case to reveal that fact. So secret were the proceedings of that court, that even a gentleman, now a bishop of the church, who went for papers, was not allowed to enter, but the clerk delivered them to him. There was no examination of copies with originals, and, in fact, they did not know whether such originals existed at all. The document referred to was not a transcript of proceedings, but an account, by the notary, of what the proceedings contained. This document was obtained in September, 1851, and the pleas were put on record in February, 1852, so that the pleas were first founded on the document, and the document was now used for proving the pleas. Again, Dr. Achilli had ceased to be a monk in 1839, and yet, by the judgment now produced, he was sentenced to seclusion in a monastery "of his order" of more strict observance.

Lord Campbell said he must take the document as evidence of the fact that the Holy Inquisition did pronounce such a sentence in 1841.

The Attorney-General did not see that in that respect its reception was very important, and it certainly did nothing to prove the truth of those charges to which it referred. He had now gone through the case, which had engaged his deepest anxiety and interest, accompanied by a constant sense of his own inability to do it justice; and, in committing it to the jury, he appealed to them whether he had endeavoured to excite any of those prejudices to which his learned friend had referred; whether he had not endeavoured to relieve the question from those religious considerations in which his learned friend had described it to be involved? He had presented to the jury the case of a man who, under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty, had been called before them to answer for a very considerable portion of his life, on charges of the most serious description, and which necessarily embarrassed and complicated one another. He (the Attorney-General) had endeavoured to disentangle them from the complexity in which they were involved. He had endeavoured to secure that their duty should be discharged in the way most desirable by an application of their minds to each distinct charge, and the evidence in their possession in regard to each. He was sure that the more the case was sifted, and the more the light was let in upon it, the better it would be for Dr. Achilli. It was a perilous issue that awaited his client, but he reposed with entire confidence on the force of truth and on the impartiality of the jury. (Applause.)

Lord Campbell then proceeded to sum up. He said, that some apprehensions had been expressed that the jury might be actuated by religious prejudices. Even had the credit of the Protestant religion been at stake, he assured them that he would look with confidence to them for a verdict founded

upon the evidence before them. But he could not see how it could be said that in this case the credit of the Protestant religion was at all involved. The character of Dr. Achilli was at stake in the deepest manner; but the charges which were imputed to him took place when he was still a priest of the Roman Catholic religion, and he (Lord Campbell) could not see how it affected the Protestant faith that a Roman Catholic priest pretended to come over to the Protestant persuasion and had no credit for his professions. Then, as to Dr. Newman, there was no danger of his being looked upon very unfavourably, though he had left the Protestant religion, and had, it was said, become a zealous champion of the Roman Catholic faith. What his Lordship disliked to see was clergymen remaining in the Protestant church who wished to be Roman Catholics; but when a man of piety and honour stated that he did not belong to the Church of England, and resigned his position in that church, and all other advantages arising from it, there was no reason to doubt the sincerity of such conduct. He must say that Dr. Newman, in attacking Dr. Achilli as he had done, had acted rashly and recklessly, even though he believed in the truth of what he said. He had asserted a number of things of which he had no personal knowledge; but he must do him the justice to say, that when an application was made to his booksellers for his name he at once stepped forward. This being a criminal information, all that the Court had to see was that there were reasonable grounds for bringing the case before a jury; and there seemed to be no doubt that the statements made by Dr. Newman affecting Dr. Achilli amounted to a libel. Two pleas had been placed upon record, the first of "Not guilty;" and there could be no doubt that the verdict of the jury upon that plea must be for the prosecutor. Formerly that would have been the only question to determine; but now the law was altered; and those who were charged with libel had an opportunity of alleging in justification that they had stated the truth, and were actuated by laudable motives. That was a great improvement in our jurisprudence; for it had taken away the reproach embodied in the saying, "The greater the truth the greater the libel." It would be for the jury to say on the evidence before them whether the various imputations justified in the second plea by Dr. Newman had been established. As to some of those imputations, hardly any proof had been adduced, while upon others most serious evidence had been offered; and it would be for the jury to say whether they believed that evidence, and whether they considered the allegations in respect of them proved. They would be furnished with a copy of those charges, and he would have to ask them whether they believed that all or any of them were true, and, if some, which. They might find that none were true; they could hardly find that all were true; and perhaps they might think that certain material ones had been established. After the eloquent speeches which they had heard from the counsel on either side, and which would have done credit to the English bar in its brightest days, they could not come to a satisfactory conclusion without having the evidence read over to them; and he, therefore, proceeded to do so. This occupied his Lordship from shortly after five till half-past eight o'clock; and in laying before the jury the substance of his notes he very sparingly alluded to the question of credibility as between conflicting statements. There were, he said, improbabilities in the story which was told by Elena Valente, and which, as far as he observed, were uncorroborated; but, if her statement was trustworthy, the sixth charge must be held proved. The evidence of Elena Valente appeared after a lapse of twenty years now to be brought forward for the first time; but that of Maria Principe was one of old standing, and therefore it was one of a very serious character. Dr. Achilli denied it; but it was clear from the evidence brought forward that complaint had been made at the time, and that the matter was not invented to suit the present emergency. The evidence with reference to Garamoni's wife he considered not at all satisfactory, as it only amounted to a meeting in the dark under suspicious circumstances. His Lordship read carefully over the evidence with regard to Co[illegible] with a caution as to the testimony of Mr. Reynolds, left it to the jury to pro-

nounce on that charge. On the transactions at Malta, the sending away of Saccares, the action of the London committee thereon, and the subsequent evidence as to alleged immoralities in London, his Lordship went steadily through his notes, never offering more than a short passing observation. He then repeated his previously-expressed view of the document purporting to be a judgment of the Inquisition on Dr. Achilli. He declared it not only to be admissible evidence, but very strong evidence, that such a sentence had been pronounced. The Court of the Inquisition was presided over by men of learning and piety. They had issued the paper in question as a document to be used in a court of justice; and he could not suppose that they wished to practise any imposition. The causes for which the sentence was pronounced formed a very different matter; and the probability was, that it related more to a charge of heresy than to one of immorality. Dr. Achilli said that it was heresy, but that was a question for the jury to decide. His Lordship treated the occurrence of the plaintiff's name in the proceedings between Garamoni and his wife as unimportant upon the merits of the case, and he disposed in a similar way of the vows of chastity and poverty taken by the Dominican monks. These, he said, were vows contrary to human nature, and were not very material. On Dr. Achilli availing himself of the privilege of the Court, and declining general questions put to test his chastity, his Lordship observed that such a course, while it gave increased probability to specific charges, also increased his credibility as a witness. Dr. Achilli, it might be said, had broken his vows of celibacy by entering into the holy state of matrimony, but that ought not to lower him in the opinion of the jury, for they all knew that Luther had married, and that, too, in London. When the reading of his notes had been completed, his Lordship said that the jury had heard the evidence on both sides. He referred them to an abstract of the plea of justification [contained in the report of Tuesday, the 22nd], and he asked them to say, whether they found any of the allegations proved; and if so, which of them? He had done his duty in the case; and he was sure they would do theirs.

The jury then (at about half-past eight) retired. They did not return into court until eleven o'clock.

On their return it was asked, "Are you agreed on your verdict?"

The Foreman.—Yes; on the 19th charge we find proved. All the rest was found not proved. (Sensation and partial cheering.)

Lord Campbell.—The 19th charge respects Dr. Achilli's being deprived of his professorship and prohibited from preaching and hearing confession. You find that to be proved?

The Foreman.—Yes, my lord, proved.

Lord Campbell.—And you find none of the other allegations proved?

The Foreman and several Jurors.—No, none of the others. (Here the people in the court, beginning to understand the verdict, burst out into a vigorous cheer, which no one attempted to suppress.)

Lord Campbell.—With regard, then, to the plea of not guilty. The first plea is not guilty. You see that involves the publication, and the question whether it was of a libellous nature.

A Juror.—Not guilty. That's what we find.

Lord Campbell.—No, understand me. The first plea is not guilty; and that involves the question whether it is proved that the defendant published this alleged libel, and whether it be libellous. Do not mind the truth of the charges at all. As to this, say only on that do you find him guilty, and that it was of a libellous nature?

The Foreman.—Yes, guilty.

Lord Campbell.—On that you find him guilty. There is then a verdict for the Crown on that. Then we come to the justification; and on the justification you find that the only part of it which is proved is the 19th, respecting Dr. Achilli being deprived of his professorship and prohibited from preaching and from hearing confession.

A Juror.—Yes, that is the verdict.

Lord Campbell.—Wait a moment, and let me see. That is (after a pause), you find that that is true which is alleged in the decree of the Inquisition, as far as that decree goes?

A Juror.—Yes.

Lord Campbell.—So far as that decree goes. You don't find as to the reasons for the decree, but as to the decree itself?

The Foreman.— Yes, only that.

Lord Campbell.—Very well. Then you find it to be true that Dr. Achilli was suspended from the celebration of mass, prohibited from any cure of souls, and from preaching, and from hearing confession, and from exercising his sacerdotal office in any way, according to the decree of the Inquisition. And all the rest you find not to be proved?

The Foreman.—Not to our satisfaction.

Lord Campbell.—Very well. Then on the justification I direct a verdict to be entered for the Crown, on that issue as well as on the plea of not guilty; and that special finding I, of course, will report to the Court when necessary. (Here again a loud cheer was given by the thronged court.) I now discharge you, gentlemen, from your attendance, and beg to thank you. (Renewed cheers.)

A Juror.—I beg your Lordship to understand that we did not consider this case as regards Protestantism and Catholicism. We only look at it as a matter of fact.

Lord Campbell.—Oh, I am sure you have dealt with it conscientiously.

Another hearty cheer was now given, which the learned judge did not for a moment attempt to check.

The jury were then discharged; and thus ended this extraordinary and memorable trial, having occupied the Court in all, forty-three hours. It is but fair to say that, during the whole of the proceedings, the jury paid undivided and unwearied attention to the mass of evidence which was laid before them, evincing an anxious and earnest desire to make themselves masters of the case to its minutest details. Of Lord Campbell it would be unbecoming for us to say more than that his conduct was marked throughout the whole case by that dignity and impartiality which have always attended his judicial character, and, if anything can add to the high reputation of that noble and learned judge, it will be his presidency on this occasion. We should also wish to add our tribute of respect to the able and impartial manner in which the interpreter originally engaged for the prosecution, but whose services were afterwards adopted by both sides, discharged his duty. The Lord Chief Justice and the leading counsel on each side alluded in the most complimentary terms to his conduct throughout the whole trial, and we never remember an instance in which this task, at once so important and difficult, was more efficiently discharged. We need scarcely say that the Court was most densely and inconveniently crowded during the whole course of the trial. The delivery of the verdict was received with unmistakable signs of approbation, which were with difficulty suppressed while his lordship remained in Court; but after his departure they broke out into loud hurrahs, which drowned most completely the hisses and groans which the friends of Dr. Newman in Court attempted to raise.

The 19th charge, which is the only one which the jury have found proven, is as follows:—That on the 16th of June, 1841, at Rome, by the Court of the Holy Office or Inquisition, the said G. G. Achilli was suspended from the celebration of mass, and disabled from any cure of souls, and from preaching and hearing confessions, and from exercising the sacerdotal office.

AWFUL DISCLOSURES!! MAYNOOTH MORALITY!!!

Seventh Thousand, price 1*s.* 6*d.* (*Post free* 6*d. extra.*)

THE CONFESSIONAL UNMASKED;

Showing the Depravity of the Priesthood, the Immorality of the Confessional, and the Abominations now taught at Maynooth; and exposing the intercourse held by Priests with the Wives and Daughters of Roman Catholics, being authenticated Extracts from the writings of celebrated Popish Saints and Divines, viz., St. Liguori, Peter Dens, Bailly, Delahogue, &c., whose works have been approved of by the College of Cardinals, and are now used as Class Books at Maynooth and other Roman Catholic Colleges.

These Extracts are given in Double Columns, in Latin and English, with References to the volume and page of the Original Works from which they are taken; therefore, those who doubt the authenticity of the Extracts, are hereby challenged to compare them with the Original Works in the British Museum.

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE receives a PARLIAMENTARY GRANT of £30,000 a year to enable her to instruct young Priests in the following *edifying* particulars, in the study of which they are compelled to spend *fifty-nine hours every week*:—

CONTENTS.

On the Seal of Sacramental Confession.
Servants who consider their wages too low may compensate themselves by stealing from their Masters to make up the deficiency.
"Sliding Scale" of the different amounts which Servants may steal from Masters in the various ranks of life.
Questions to be put to young men and women about twenty years of age.
Questions to be put to all persons about to be married.
Questions to be put to newly-married and other ladies.
How women may commit Adultery with impunity, together with full Instructions how to deceive their husbands afterwards.
But a man is bound to keep inviolable faith with an Harlot, *and cannot be absolved from a promise made to her!!!*
Fornication with a Protestant is more sinful than with a Catholic.
Visiting a lady *in her sick chamber* is a just cause for a Priest entertaing Motions of Sensuality!!!
How often in the month Priests may *deliberately* commit Fornication or Adultery in the Confessional, independent of accidental or unpremeditated slips on other occasions, such as when paying visits, &c.
Various sins which man and wife may commit with each other.
Causes which invalidate Matrimony.
Concerning widows, and persons married a second time.
Priests may swear they do not know what was told to them in Confession, because in that case the know it *only as God.*
All persons may swear falsely, even when on oath, before Judges.
Priests may deceive the dying, by pretending to give Absolution, when, in reality they do *not* give it.
On Concealing and Dissembling the Faith.
Persons who have not been absolved may obtain Testimonials from the Priest stating that they were absolved.

London: W. STRANGE, 8 Amen-corner, Paternoster-row.

*** *This will be found a complete Text Book of the Romish Controversy.*

Manchester: Abel Heywood, 58, Oldham-street.
Liverpool: Edward Howell, 6, Church-street.

FAITH AND CRITICISM;

OR

Dependence on God, and Independence of Man.

BY

J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D.D.

BEING AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF

THE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, BELFAST,

PRINTED FROM HIS OWN MANUSCRIPT UNDER THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE COLLEGE FACULTY.

WITH AN

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION,

AND AN AUTHENTIC REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS ON THE OCCASION.

BELFAST:
JOHN SHEPHERD, 9 HIGH STREET.
EDINBURGH: JOHNSTONE & HUNTER, WM. WHYTE & CO., W. P. KENNEDY, MURRAY & STUART. LONDON: HAMILTON & CO., J. NISBET & CO.
GLASGOW: D. BRYCE. DUBLIN: CURRY & CO.

MDCCCLIII.

BELFAST : PRINTED BY M'CORMICK AND ROBIE, BANNER OF ULSTER OFFICE.

OPENING

OF THE

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, BELFAST.

On Monday, the 5th December 1853, the various thoroughfares in Belfast and the neighbourhood presented a scene of unusual animation. The day was exceedingly fine, and, a little before eleven o'clock, groups of the respectable inhabitants were to be seen, on all sides, moving in the direction of the new Presbyterian College. Even a stranger might have known that some event, deeply interesting to the population of the metropolis of the North, was about to be celebrated. The Ulster and Ballymena Railway Companies had agreed to accept half fares from all who wished to attend on the occasion; and, as the several trains arrived, they poured forth a copious stream of passengers who were on their way to the approaching ceremony. The first Presbyterian College erected in Ireland, since it ceased to be "The Isle of Saints," was about to be opened; and Dr. Merle D'Aubigné of Geneva, a Presbyterian divine of world-wide fame, was about to take a prominent part in its inauguration.

It is somewhat remarkable that, though the Irish Presbyterian Church has been so long without a seminary of its own in which to train its candidates for the ministry, it attracts the notice of the historian as early as the sixteenth century, in connexion with collegiate education. When the University of Dublin was established, its first regular provost was the Rev. Walter Travers, an eminent Presbyterian minister, and its first fellows were two learned Scottish Presbyterians. Under Presbyterian teachers, Primate Ussher laid the foundations of his fame, and the University itself acquired distinguished reputation. But, about forty years after its erection, the statutes of the college were remo-

delled, and Presbyterians were shut out from its offices of trust and dignity. Though they soon afterwards recovered their position, they were finally excluded, in 1661, by the passing of the Act of Uniformity.

When Presbyterians ceased to be connected with the Established Church, and when they could no longer conscientiously avail themselves of the benefits of the Irish College, their students for the ministry generally repaired for instruction to one or other of the Scottish universities. At an early period, this arrangement was found to be attended with many disadvantages, and, accordingly, various attempts were made to supply a home education. In 1674, a theological seminary was established at Antrim, under the sanction of the Church, and the celebrated John Howe, then domestic chaplain to the Massareene family, was one of its professors. At a subsequent date, institutions of the same character existed at Killileagh, Newtownards, and elsewhere. But, as all these seminaries were destitute of suitable support, they soon languished and disappeared. Towards the close of the last century, the Government of the country began to look with greater favour on Irish Presbyterianism; and, in 1795, under the viceroyalty of Earl Fitzwilliam, the Synod of Ulster was encouraged to expect the erection of a Presbyterian College in the North, with a state endowment of £2000 per annum. The project failed in consequence of a sudden change of the administration, and though, about the period of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland, the proposal was revived, it eventually miscarried. In 1815 the collegiate classes of the Belfast Academical Institution were opened, and for the next quarter of a century the mass of the Irish Presbyterian students preparing for the ministry were educated at that seminary. At length, however, the Presbyterian Church became very much dissatisfied with its arrangements, and, in 1844, the General Assembly, at a special meeting held in Cookstown, resolved to erect a college of its own. When it was proceeding to collect funds for the accomplishment of this object, the scheme of the Irish Queen's Colleges was promulgated; it then deemed it prudent to suspend, for a time, its operations; and when the Queen's College, Belfast, was opened, as it considered that this institution afforded a safe and sufficient education for its students, in all the ordinary branches of literary

and scientific instruction, it resolved, instead of attempting to make provision for the whole of a university curriculum, to confine its exertions to the establishment of a strictly Presbyterian College—that is, of a theological seminary for the special training of candidates for the Presbyterian ministry. It has succeeded in erecting such an institution. The course of instruction embraces systematic divinity, sacred criticism and interpretation, ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology, Christian ethics, sacred rhetoric and catechetics, Hebrew, and ecclesiastical Greek; and Government has endowed seven professorships. The new building was commenced in spring 1852, and now, in December 1853, is ready for the reception of professors and students.

The Presbyterian College stands at the extremity of University Square, and in the immediate vicinity of the Queen's College and the Royal Botanic Garden. It is erected on a plot of ground, of upwards of an acre and a half in extent, held in perpetuity, at a merely nominal rent. It was designed by Charles Lanyon, Esq., the eminent civil-engineer, and built by John Corry, Esq., who has executed the work in a style which has elicited universal admiration. To those who may not have seen the College, a brief description of it will not be unacceptable.

The style in which the building has been designed and carried out is the Renaissance; and as the material of which it is composed is of cut stone, from the quarries at Scrabo, in the County Down, the façade presents at once a lively and attractive appearance. The building consists of a centre-piece and two wings, extending in front about 135 feet. It is raised on a bold moulded plinth, upon which rests the ground-floor stage, of rusticated ashlar, having quoins and dressings to the several openings, and the openings themselves circular headed, panelled, and vermiculated. A simple string course divides this from the upper stage, which is of plain ashlar, with raised and panelled quoins; the windows being square-headed, finished with moulded architraves, and having a cornice with segmental pediments. The main cornice crowns this portion of the work, and, except over a centre-piece in the front elevation, where there is an addition of an attic storey, the whole is surmounted by a handsome blocking course with receding consols, over semi-detached columns below. The centre-piece is of three bays, marked by semi-detached columns, of the

Doric order, three feet six inches in diameter; these, with the entablature, presenting a beautiful appearance.

Entrance is obtained into the building by a raised platform, through three boldly rusticated and vermiculated archways, into a grand portico, from which the principal door leads into the hall. The hall is a spacious and elegant apartment, one storey in height, and having Doric columns opposite the entrance. Through it access is obtained to corridors leading north and south, into large lecture-rooms placed in the wings, and having in connection with them appropriate rooms for the professors. From these corridors egress is also obtained to the grounds in the rere.

Through arches, opposite the Doric columns already mentioned, approach is obtained by a handsome staircase, lighted by a triple window, to a spacious landing on the first floor, north and south of which are groined vestibules, leading into the grand centre-room of the library. The library is the principal room in the building, and the richest in finish. It is eighty-five feet in length, and is divided into three compartments by Corinthian columns and entablature. The centre compartment is thirty-five feet square, and thirty feet in height—the extent of the attic storey higher than the side portions; and the square form of the central portion is most tastefully reduced to a circle in the upper part by coved spandrils, rising over Corinthian entablature. The segmental spaces on the east and west sides are pierced with semicircular windows, with enriched architraves; and, on the the north and south sides, there are neatly executed panels, having the Ulster arms, with foliage formed to correspond. The circular ceiling is divided into radiating panels, with rich mouldings, and having a circular panel in the centre, filled with a foliated centre-piece.

Large lecture-rooms, in the wings immediately above those on the ground-floor, are approached by corridors leading from the vestibule. The height to the top of the blocking over the wings is about 44 feet, and the total height of the centre portion is about 56 feet. The complete design comprehends a return of each wing, facing the north and south, about 120 feet in length, each having a centre formed by columns somewhat similar to those in front, omitting the attic storey; these portions, however, are not executed, the funds of the Committee permitting them to complete merely the front portion of the design. On the whole, the build-

ing is, taking its dimensions into account, the finest architectural edifice in Belfast, and admirably suited to the object had in view in its construction.

SERVICES IN THE COLLEGE HALL.

The hour for the opening of the College having arrived, the Common Hall was soon filled with the professors and students, and several hundreds of respectable visitors. On an elevated platform appeared the Rev. Dr. Molyneaux, Moderator of the General Assembly; the Rev. R. Park, Clerk of the Assembly; the Rev. Dr. Cooke, President of the Faculty, in his official robes; and the Rev. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné of Geneva. The Moderator gave out the 100th Psalm, which was sung with thrilling effect by the large assemblage; read the second chapter of Paul's second epistle to Timothy—a passage peculiarly suitable to the occasion—and then offered up an impressive prayer.

The Rev. Dr. Cooke then rose and said—Mr. Moderator and Christian friends, in the thrice glorious name of our God, this our edifice has been this day opened; and we do trust that that blessing which has been sought will come down upon us, and abide with us for ever and ever. I address you now simply as touching the temporality of our position; and most of you are aware that, in 1847, and also in 1851, the General Assembly of our Church appointed and empowered certain persons to solicit subscriptions from the Christian public for the purpose of obtaining a site at Belfast, and of erecting a College thereon, for the better instruction of its candidates for the Christian ministry. The public responded to these applications with great readiness and no little liberality—you see around you this day the fruits of that liberality; and although we are still in need of further funds, the Lord, who has helped us hitherto, and to whom belongeth the silver and the gold, we doubt not, will help us, until all that we require of a temporal kind, for the spiritual instruction of our ministers, shall have been obtained. We have secured the site upon which this edifice has been erected, and [the doctor here lifted the lease of tenure of the ground upon which the College is built] though I intend

to show you this document, in which our temporal rights are secured, all that it is needful for me now to present to you is a statement of the nature of the trust upon which it is held, and of the purposes of the trust. Some years ago, all matters of trust of this kind were exceedingly unsatisfactory; I mean unsatisfactory in this way, that the last surviving trustee not only held the title-right, but that his heir-at-law held the same right. That heir-at-law might be in the East or in the West, or he might be altogether unknown; and, consequently, great difficulty was oftentimes experienced either in maintaining or renewing trusts. By a statute of the 13th and 14th years of the reign of our gracious Queen these difficulties are altogether removed; and we do not now require the ponderous machinery of leaseholders making to others a cession of trust, delivering that trust to their survivors, and still leaving the building in the difficulties to which I have referred. Those who hold a property by indenture of lease are now able, by the statute to which I have referred, to make a simple declaration of the ends and purposes of the trust, and that, to all intents and purposes, is all that is requisite. They can do more; they can settle the appointment of their successors; and the law provides that, in case this should not be done, the parties for whom the trust was originally held shall be competent, by a very simple legal process, to provide an authentic document of the nature and objects of the trust. I shall simply, then, read to you the trust for which this building has been erected, for which the liberality of our Christian friends has been so largely taxed, and for which, too, I may say, their liberality has been so willingly conceded, so that every one may know the ends for which this building has been erected, and the purposes to which the funds have been contributed:—

"This indenture, made this 5th day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty-three, witnesseth, that whereas the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland did, in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty-seven, and afterwards in the year one thousand eight hundred and fifty-one, resolve to solicit funds for the erection of a College at Belfast, for the education of their candidates for the

Christian ministry; and whereas certain ministers and elders, by said Assembly duly authorised, as from their authentic records may more fully appear, did succeed in obtaining subscriptions for said purpose; and whereas, by indenture bearing date the 5th day of March, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-two, Jane Gregg did grant and demise to James Kennedy, Thomas M'Clure, Robert Corry, William Todd, and William Kirk, a certain parcel of land, therein described, for the purpose of erecting thereon a College, in connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the buildings whereof are now, to a certain extent, ready for the reception and accommodation of the professors and students of said Assembly; and whereas said General Assembly, by virtue of their constitution, as organised and declared at the union of the General Synod of Ulster and Secession Synod, happily effected in the year one thousand eight hundred and forty, do require that every candidate for the ministry, before obtaining license to preach, that every minister and elder, previous to ordination, and that every professor of their College, previous to inauguration, shall be required to subscribe the Westminster Confession of Faith, in the following terms, that is to say—'I believe the Westminster Confession of Faith to be founded on, and agreeable to, the Word of God, and as such I subscribe it as the confession of my faith:'—Now, to the end that in all time coming said funds may be applied to the purposes for which they were originally solicited and contributed, and to no other, and that said College may continue to be occupied and possessed by the parties, and their successors, for whom it was originally erected, and by no others, the aforesaid James Kennedy, Robert Corry, Thomas M'Clure, William Todd, and William Kirk, do hereby declare, that they have obtained, and do hold, as aforesaid, the said land and College buildings thereon, in trust for the said General Assembly and their successors in the ministry, and for the aforesaid professors and their successors in their respective departments, as professing and teaching the doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and subscribing the same in terms of the aforesaid formula. And they do hereby further declare, that, on the demise of any of them, successively, it shall be lawful for said General Assembly to elect and appoint a successor or successors in this trusteeship, agreeably to the provision of the

statute 13 and 14 Victoria, chap. 33, for such cases made and provided.

"William Kirk. (Seal.)
"Robert Corry. (Seal.)
"Thomas M'Clure. (Seal.)
"James Kennedy. (Seal.)

"Witnessed by James Morgan."

The reverend doctor concluded by announcing that his distinguished friend, Dr. D'Aubigné, would deliver the inaugural address at one o'clock, in Fisherwick Place Church.

The benediction having been pronounced by Dr. Molyneaux, the assembly adjourned to Fisherwick Place.

MEETING IN FISHERWICK PLACE CHURCH.

Long prior to the day of inauguration, it was ascertained that the large Common Hall of the College would be quite insufficient to accommodate all who were anxious to hear the address of Dr. D'Aubigné. It had been accordingly arranged that, at the close of the introductory services by the Moderator of Assembly, the meeting should adjourn, and re-assemble, at one o'clock, in Fisherwick Place Church. Before the appointed time, that specious edifice was crowded by a brilliant auditory. When Dr. D'Aubigné entered, he was most enthusiastically cheered. On the platform appeared Dr. Cooke, President of Faculty, who occupied the chair; Dr. Edgar, Dr. Wilson, Dr. Killen, Professor Gibson, Dr. Murphy, Dr. Morgan, Dr. Brown of Aghadoey, and Thomas M'Clure, Esq., the treasurer of the College. At a short distance from the platform sat three Peers, all, indeed, members of the Episcopal Church, but each suggesting precious recollections to Irish Presbyterians. A prominent position had been assigned to the Earl of Roden, a nobleman whose Christian character has long shed a lustre on the British aristocracy, and whose self-denying exertions on behalf of the persecuted Madiai have just earned for him a new claim on the admiration and gratitude of all true Protestants. Two hundred and sixty years ago, James Hamilton, a Scottish Presbyterian, and a Fellow of the College, took part in the opening of the

Dublin University,* and his descendant, Lord Roden, now appeared in a Presbyterian meeting-house, as well to sanction, by his presence, the inauguration of another great educational institute of Irish Protestantism, as to testify his respect for the Church of his accomplished and learned ancestor. In another conspicuous position appeared Viscount Massareene and Ferrard, the heir of the great and good Sir John Clotworthy of Antrim, who sat in the Westminster Assembly, and assisted in the preparation of the formularies of the Presbyterian Church.† Immediately in front of the pulpit and the platform sat the Right Rev. Dr. Knox, Lord-Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore —a prelate collaterally related to the great Scottish Reformer, and the lineal descendant of that good old Mr. Andrew Knox, Bishop of Raphoe, who used to say that his life seemed to be spared that he might perform offices of kindness to conscientious Presbyterian ministers.‡

There were also present Sir W. G. Johnson, General Thomas, Lieutenant-Colonel Rumley, the Mayor of Belfast, the Mayor-Elect, the Town-Clerk, and a large proportion of the members of the Town Council. Without appending a long list of names, it may be sufficient to state that, in addition to the general public, there were in atendance two members of the present House of Commons, three ex-members of Parliament, eight deputy-lieutenants of counties, sixteen magistrates, ninety-six Presbyterian ministers, a considerable number of ministers of other denominations, and upwards of one hundred Presbyterian students. Had Dr. D'Aubigné been at liberty to consent to deliver the address on Tuesday, instead of Monday, the attendance would have been absolutely overwhelming.

The Rev. Dr. Cooke opened the meeting by reading the 127th Psalm, which was sung by the immense assembly. He then read the first chapter of the first epistle general of John, and afterwards offered up a fervent prayer.

The devotional exercises having been concluded, Dr. Cooke then spoke as follows :—My Christian friends, in a few words, I

* "Reid's History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," vol. i. p. 56, second edition.

† "History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," vol. i. p. 388.

‡ "History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland," vol. i. p. 111.

beg to introduce to you our friend, who has come, at great inconvenience, during an inclement period of the year, and from a great distance, to speak to us a word of brotherly kindness and encouragement. Our friend, who will shortly address you, was desirous of speaking in his native tongue, the French; and though, no doubt, there are many who would be able to understand the purport of his discourse in that language, we earnestly requested him, for the sake of those who do not understand it, that the living word should be delivered in a tongue with which he is not acquainted so well as to enable him with facility to manage either our pronunciation or our idioms. Our friend has kindly consented to submit to this difficulty, and I am persuaded that, though he speaks with the tongue of a foreigner, yet he is, nevertheless, so well acquainted with the idioms of our language, that there will be no difficulty in following him. When I introduce to you Dr. Merle D'Aubigné of Geneva, I am aware that I do not require to say one word by way of introduction. He is known wherever Protestantism is known—he is known wherever sacred literature is known—he is known in every land where the glorious Reformation lifts its banner—known in every land where its victories still abide, and where its high and exalted hopes are going forth conquering and to conquer. I will not say one word of Dr. D'Aubigné's personal and literary merits, because he is so well known to all Christian lands and to all true Protestants, that his name is a sufficient introduction. I beg to introduce Dr. D'Aubigné to the meeting.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

Mr. President, Professors, Students of the Presbyterian College, and Christian Brethren,—Everything around me fills me with astonishment;—Ireland, which I now behold for the first time, and which I never expected to see;—Ireland, which, in the seventh and eighth centuries, was a haven for learning, driven from the rest of Europe;—Ireland, which then sent its missionaries to more than one continental nation, in particular to the Pagans of part of Switzerland, my native country;—Ireland, which gave birth to the devoted Gallus, who, penetrating, for the preaching of Christ, into our Swiss forests, full of wolves and bears, exclaimed, "If God is for us, who can be against us;"—this province of Ulster in particular, less remarkable for its Giant's Causeway, and the exploits of Fingal, than for its Presbyterian population, which, transforming Ireland wherever it takes root, changes idleness into industry, instead of robbery and murder, inspires respect for life and property, instead of riot and rebellion, submission to the laws and loyalty to the Queen; because, in place of superstition and Romish traditions, it teaches everywhere the Word and the grace of God. This fine town of Belfast, with its industry and its commerce, its factories and its colleges; this new Hall, for the inauguration of which I am come; these professors, these students, this assembly itself, showing so deep an interest in the proceedings of this day—all amaze me; but, I must say, what astonishes me most is to find myself here!—I, who scarcely know the English language, in which, notwithstanding, I must address you; I, who, born at the foot of the Alps, have come a thousand miles to pass one hour with you; I, who must recognise, not only among your brethren in England and Scotland, but here amongst you, Presbyterians of Ireland, so many more able divines than myself, who could have added a power and an eclat to this ceremony which I can

in no way bestow on it. I ask myself if it is indeed *I* who am speaking to you, or whether it is a dream? I feel amongst you like a horse I saw lately yoked in a railway-station, hanging his head, as if ashamed, before such powerful engines, of his very scanty aid. Doubtless you will experience the same surprise I feel at seeing me here, and I must explain the strange circumstance. In the course of the summer, a letter from the Committee of your Presbyterian College asked me to come and inaugurate the new building. I decidedly refused, and justified my refusal by a reference to my inability, the difficulties of the journey so late in the season, my age, my duties, which confine me to Geneva; and, finally, I declared that I was a barbarian as to your language, and that a barbarian's tongue is not fitted to address an academical meeting. But all was unavailing. Your commission resolved to act upon the words in Luke xiv. 23—"*Compel them to come in.*" They sent me a deputation of two excellent men—one of them known amongst Swiss Christians as a benefactor of Connaught; and when they told me that I had been invited by the whole of your great Presbyterian Church, I said to your deputies, I am going to commit a folly, but I am willing "to be a fool for Christ's sake," (1 Cor. iv. 10.) And here I am.

If I ask for the motive which fixed your choice, I can find but one. You wished for a man from the city of Calvin—Calvin, who founded the Academy of Geneva—Calvin, the great theologian. But, alas! the mighty recollection of Calvin which attracted you is precisely what alarms me; for, instead of a giant you have a child.

The question which suggests itself to my mind is, "How can British Christians in general, and specially Presbyterians, accomplish the task which God has placed before them, not only in the United Kingdom, but throughout the world?" British Christians, you have a vocation from on high; you can only fulfil it by making use of the arms which true evangelical divinity puts into your hands. But what are these arms?

Two primitive laws of our nature teach the theologian and the Christian how to accomplish their mission. First of all, there is a law in man which impresses on him submission to the infinite Being. An illustrious theologian, Schleiermacher, has defined religion as consisting in an absolute dependence upon God. But,

besides this law, there is another, that of liberty—the independence of man with respect to all created beings.

Two duties proceed from these two essential laws. The first is the duty of *obedience* to God—of *faith* in His Word. "*Let us be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live.*"—(Hebrews xii. 9.) The second duty is that of submitting all that proceeds from the creature to examination, and of rejecting all that we do not find conformable to the law of God. "*Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.*"—(1 Thess. v. 21.)

All the evils of human thought, especially in the matter of religion, result from not applying these two laws properly. The errors of superstition arise from applying the law of submission to things finite, so that numerous superfluities are added to the Word of God. The errors of infidelity arise from applying the law of criticism to the Supreme Being, so that the Holy Scriptures and the counsels of God are overturned. There are men who range themselves on the side of criticism, others on that of faith; but theologians must be neither without faith nor without criticism: only, let us not be deceived as to the use to be made of one or the other. The Jews who built Jerusalem, under Nehemiah, had a positive and a negative work to fulfil. The positive was to build the wall with the trowel; the negative, to fight against Ammon with the sword. If they had defended themselves with the trowel, and built the wall with the sword, they would have failed in their work. The same failure would result from mistaking the use of faith and criticism. Faith must take the precedence. The truly necessary and useful criticism is that of the new man, and not that of the old man. The spirit of fallen man, blinded by the passions of an unruly soul, is a useless instrument as to Christian doctrine. When Diogenes went to seek a man, he took a lantern, at least, in his hand. But critical rationalism pretends to seek the truth, without either lantern or sun, by groping in the dark. It is not from reason that religion takes its rise: it is from conscience; consequently faith precedes criticism. The greatest theologian of the British isles, the most celebrated of the archbishops of Canterbury, Anselm, says—"*Per fidem ad intellectum.*" Let us, then, begin by faith, as the first duty of a true minister and evangelical Christian.

FAITH.

If we listen to the enemies of Protestantism, the greatest danger of this system would be the tendency which it gives to the human mind. According to them, the essence of Protestantism consists in not receiving the truth as it is revealed to us, but in first submitting it to the judgment of our individual reason. "Therefore," say they, "no commandment retains any authority whatever. Everywhere we find the child saying to its father, the scholar to his master, the citizen to the judge and the lawgiver—Why so?" Never was an accusation more formally contradicted by history. If we desire to know the very different consequences of the Protestant and Romish systems, in the order of social events, let us ask where there is more submission to law, more order, loyalty—in Great Britain, for instance, or in France and Italy? Socinus and his adherents have made reason a judge of the Scriptures. "*Quod humanæ rationi non est adæquatum frustra revelatur.*" "What is not conformable to human reason is revealed in vain," (*Schlichting de Trinitate.*) But there is no tendency against which Protestantism has waged a more decided war. Dependence, submission, this is always according to Protestantism the position of man with regard to God, and man's acts of dependence, are successively required from Protestants.

The first act of dependence which Protestantism imposes on man, in every Protestant nation, is coming to the Bible as to the only source of religion. Whence came the Reformation? From the Bible! Luther sought peace for his soul in a convent; he found it not there! He sought it in fastings and watchings, and all the exercises of an ascetic life; he found it not there. He sought it in the writings of scholastic divines; he found it not there. It was then that, having laid his hands upon a folio volume in the library of the College at Erfurt, he saw this title, "*Biblia Sacra.*" He opened the book, he read, and read again; and the peace of God, which he had never been able to find, was bestowed upon him by the Scriptures. His faith had made him free! He proclaimed the truth.

Biblical theology, then, is the theology of Protestantism. I insist upon it, because an opposite system is the great danger of

the British Churches in the present time. Young, noble, but incautious minds, like to maintain their liberty toward the Scripture. Conscience, they say, must be our only leader. I have heard *that* many times in France and Geneva. But Protestantism did not raise the Scriptures from the tomb to domineer over them, but to obey them. "The Church," said Peter Martyr, (well known in England), "faithfully keeps the words of God contained in the Scriptures. She is like a notary to whose honesty a will has been entrusted, who knows that if he change anything, he is not an honest notary, but a forger, (*falsarius et testamentarius.*") "That man is led astray," says Melancthon, "who seeks Christianity in any other than the canonical Scriptures." "*Quam e Scriptura canonica.*" "The Holy Scriptures," said Zwingle, "must be our master and our general." "*Ducem et magistrum.*"

Young men of Great Britain and Ireland, remember, then, that every liberty is not good; for there is a liberty *according to the flesh.* Do you ask why Protestantism, after noble conquests, stopped short—nay, retrograded—in various countries in the seventeenth century? I answer, because it did not go on as it began. Two systems which weakened, arrested, and perverted the Reformation, successively supplanted the living principle of Biblical theology; first, the scholasticism of the seventeenth century, and then the rationalism of the eighteenth — that spiritual rationalism which a distinguished professor has maintained, in the University of London, comes from Germany, and at the very moment when it is rising in England it is falling in Germany. I have been recently in Berlin, in the great diet of the Church. I can bear witness to this.

Let us go, then, again and again, to the fountain-head—to the Holy Scriptures. If you cut off a brook or a river from the source from which it springs, it dries up. If you bow your head before that new rationalism—if you separate Christian doctrine for a single moment from its source, the Bible—then, in the place of living waters, we shall only find in the British isles the barren sand of human opinion. But to go to the source is not enough. To give to the great God the obedience which is due to Him, Protestantism teaches you to take His word as the infallible authority. There are theologians, the champions of critical

rationalism, who daily study the Scriptures, but who do not go to them as a child to the breast of its mother, to draw the sincere milk of the Word, and grow thereby, (1 Peter ii. 21 ;) they go to them, as a surgeon, with knives to sever limbs from a body. We must take the words of the Bible for realities, and not for images. When the Scriptures speak to us of *election, a new birth, the blood shed for many,* and *eternal punishment,* these must not be considered as mere figures of speech, but as great realities. You may throw aside the Bible, like the unbeliever ; but if you receive it, you cannot alter its meaning. Respect for the sacred writings is nothing else than respect for Christ himself. To interpret the Bible, not according to the spirit of the Bible, but according to the spirit of the age, not from the meaning of the Bible, but from the meaning of the times, is a revolt against God. Instead of lighting other lights from the primitive one, you extinguish that light itself. A pretty way, indeed, of seeing clearly. When Nadab and Abihu, sons of Aaron, offered strange fire before the Lord, fire came out from the Lord, and consumed them. It is forbidden (let us remember) to place strange fire on the altar of the Holy Scriptures. The principle for the interpretation of the Bible is in the *Bible itself.* The deplorable result of all the false systems of theology which have sought for this principle—interpretation, reason, conscience, criticism, philosophy, tradition, ultramontanism—urges us to abandon such ways, in which men have always gone astray. "The meaning of Scripture is always simple," said Melancthon, "like heavenly truth itself. You find it by comparing Scripture with Scripture ; you draw it from the thread, the analogy of the word ; *e filo ductuque orationis.*"

Let us go farther, and acknowledge a third duty, which Protestantism prescribes to man in every nation. We must respect the Scriptures, not only as a whole, but also in detail ; not only in those great teachings on which our eternal destiny depends, but in the smallest word.

An important business of the new rationalistic school is what they call in French *priage*—that is, picking out, choosing what is good in the Bible, and rejecting what is wrong. Some who do not go so far, who concede a certain inspiration, maintain that the words are not inspired. But if a sacred writer, expressing a

truth given of God, make use of wrong words, he then expresses not a truth, but an error. No, no, brethren. The human wordof Scripture is always a word of God, not only for the truth of the doctrine, but also for accuracy, propriety, purity of expression. Perhaps we may not understand some declaration of the Bible, and some may imagine that there is a fault in it. But see, after thousands and thousands of years, the faithfulness of the revelation of God in its details is now appearing out of the sandy hills of Nineveh ; let us wait, and it will appear also out of the divine depths of Scripture. Scripture is a temple. "*Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.*"—Ex. iii. 5.

In the Romish temples you may feel the presence of art, be seized with a feeling of the beautiful : some great features may strike you, and you may neglect the details ; but, in the temple of Scripture, there is not the smallest thing which does not command our veneration. God is everywhere ; His train fills the temple, and the whole is full of His glory. In all, even in the least important parts, salutary teaching is given. It is God's way often to act more effectually by small things than by great. It is by the study of details that we rise to the intelligence and feeling of the whole. Scripture, then—all Scripture, as Paul says—no picking out, no selecting !—πασα γραφη.

But it is not enough to receive all Scripture. The submission due to the Most High, which Protestantism imposes on man in every Protestant nation, demands a fourth act from us. We must believe the witness of God, and by that faith Christ must become to us not only the truth, but also the life. *It is impossible to please God without faith*, says St. Paul.—(Heb. xi. 6.) To constitute an evangelical Christian, it is not sufficient, as some say, to concede that there is a revelation from God. "In reading the Bible," says Luther, "you must understand that everything refers to Jesus Christ." The Bible is not Jesus Christ, but it is the testimony of Jesus Christ ; and the first use that man should make of it is to believe in Jesus Christ by it. The testimony rendered to the God-man must bring us to the God-man himself. The Word which is in the Bible must make us partakers of the Word which is with the Father. If the one does not communicate the other, we have received nothing as yet. Not that every kind of faith is good.

To be an act of submission to the Most High, the faith of a Protestant Christian must not be vague, without character; it must be decided, and must separate clearly between light and darkness, truth and error. Some pretend (for instance Continental broadway Unitarians), that faith may believe indifferently that Christ is the Creator or the creature. But is that truth worth anything, of which the contrary is not a lie? To be an act of submission to the Most High, the faith of a Protestant Christian must be internal and living. "There is," say some Romanists, to draw people into their net, "there is more piety in the Roman Catholic religion than in the Protestant." It is quite the contrary. A celebrated Roman controversialist—Möhler himself—confessed that the nature of Protestantism is essentially internal. Humility, love of Christ, powerful religious life, are far more characteristic of evangelical Christianity than of Romanism; for Romanism leaves the soul in a state of death, from the very fact that it throws it upon an ecclesiastical mechanism and external forms—cisterns without water. To be an act of submission to the Most High, the faith of a Protestant Christian must revere the mysteries of God. The Roman controversialists, on the Continent at least, assert constantly that Protestantism is afraid of mysteries. Strange accusation! Protestantism believes in the mysteries of the Trinity, the fall of man, the incarnation, the expiation, the new birth, the presence of Christ, not only in the sacrament, but in the Church generally, and especially in our hearts by faith. Reformed Christianity believes even more mysteries than the Roman Church. The latter weakens most of the mysteries we have just named; and, moreover, the Reformed Church believes in election—the most sublime of mysteries—and in a righteousness imputed—the most glorious one;—whilst the Romish doctors reject the first, and change the second into a comprehensible doctrine of a righteousness infused. That a sinner is justified, according to the eternal councils of God, by faith in a righteousness which is not his own, is indeed a mystery that no one can fathom, and yet of which the Christian's soul has a perfect assurance; because God has said it, and he believes God. But that a man should be saved simply (as the Romish doctrine asserts) because he accepts the grace which God offers him, and with this help he

leads a virtuous life, certainly that would be easy to understand, if it were only true!

Yes, absolute submission to the Father of spirits is the first duty of man, according to the Protestant belief; and it separates it from the Romish system, which, by preaching obedience to priests and submission to human traditions, takes from God that which is due to Him. True authority and true obedience are not within the pale of Rome; but they characterise Protestantism.

Ye young men who listen to me, there is a crisis in the Christian life, which, perhaps, is drawing near to you, and the only means to master it is by complete submission. I remember, in my young days, being in Germany, tossed about by rationalism more than I have just been by the stormy sea which separates your islands, I only found peace by prostrating myself at the feet of Jesus Christ upon the cross—at the feet of the Father of spirits in His Word.—Silence! Obedience! Adoration!—I say with Corneille, the first of French poets—

* "Parle seul à mon cœur, et qu'aucune prudence,
Qu'aucun autre docteur ne m'explique tes lois;
Que toute creature, en ta sainte présence,
S'impose le silence—
Et laisse agir ta voix!"—Corneille.

CRITICISM.

But if every man finds in himself the law of absolute submission to God, he has also the consciousness of his liberty, with regard to finite beings; and if the obedience of faith results from the first of these conditions, examination and criticism follow from the second. Liberty and independence are essential to evangelical Christianity, and these characteristics must distinguish it from the Romish system, as well as obedience and faith. "Ye are bought with a price," says the Scripture; "be not ye the servants of men?" "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

If our duty is to submit to the revelation of God in the Bible, necessarily we must reject all that is not conformable to

* Do Thou alone speak to my heart. May no other wisdom, no other teacher, explain to me Thy laws. Let every creature keep silence in Thy presence, and suffer Thy voice only to be heard.

that revelation. Therefore, what is *faith* with respect to *God*, becomes *criticism* with respect to *man*. These two principles, in reality, are one and the same.

Only let us remark, that if there be a true criticism, there is also a false one. All that God does, Satan imitates. True criticism springs from faith; false criticism from doubt. The former walks in the pure light of Divine revelation; the latter in the darkness of fallen intelligence. True criticism seeks, above all things, the truth; false criticism prefers its own researches to truth itself. The former purifies, fortifies, preserves; the latter dissolves, weakens, and destroys. True criticism, the fruit of spiritual life, produces joy, peace, faith, holiness; false criticism, the fruit of the flesh, produces sadness, trouble, unbelief, and loosens the bonds of morality. The first is that of the Reformation, the second that of Rationalism.

Courage, then, Evangelical Theologians! Grasp the sword of sound criticism, and begin your combat by the examination, the criticism of your own selves. This was the origin of the Reformation. The struggle which took place in the cell at Erfurt, when Luther, examining himself, was terrified at finding no righteousness within or without. That is the first criticism which Protestantism demands—"Knowledge of Sin."—(Rom. iii. 20.) This criticism, young theologians, will show you that certain special features of our nature, a certain enthusiasm, a certain love of divinity and humanity, certain fasts, certain privations, a certain ascetic piety, which the Romish religion, for want of criticism, considers as sterling piety, carry in themselves the deadly seed of corruption. This criticism will show you that the Concupiscentia, which the Council of Trent (5th session), for want of criticism, does not consider as a sin, is, on the contrary, the first step in man to evil, the most inward sin. "*Prava conversio ad carnalia in superioribus viribus*," says Melanchton. This holy criticism of the conscience will pursue you as long as you find in yourself any contradiction to the Divine law; it will work in you until you have found that peace with God which God alone can give.

And now that you have begun criticism within yourselves, continue it without. Evangelical Theologians! strike with the sword of criticism that tradition upon which Rome founds all

its errors, and without which (she dares to say) the Scriptures themselves are but a hieroglyphic. Tradition—a name by which every one understands what he pleases—tradition is, according to some—(doctors of the former ages)—certain teachings of Christ and His apostles not included in the Holy Scripture; according to others—(the Council of Trent and the Tractarians)—certain doctrines of the fathers of the first six centuries; according to others—(Vincent of Lerins, and, in our days, Dr. Hilgers)—the perpetual and uninterrupted doctrine of the Church; according to a fourth opinion—(Dr. Möhler's)—the Word of God in the faithful; according to a fifth—(Dr. Wiseman's)—the teaching of a particular body of priests, whom Christ, in His Word, has clothed with a power equal to His own. Tradition! strange monster! which, like Proteus, takes every form!—Reject it boldly under all. . . . It is the want of criticism which, in the course of ages, has allowed what came from men to grow up side by side with what came from God, both being adopted by the Council of Trent, "with equal respect and piety." It is for want of criticism that, heaping opinion on opinion, they have raised up that vast, but weak structure—tradition—which has obstructed the light of the Word of God. Maintain that all human teaching is liable to a mixture of error in this sinful world, and judge all oral traditions by the standard of the written Word.

Go farther. Strike with the sword of true criticism the dominion of that proud Church which claims infallibility—which would exercise dominion over the Lord's inheritance—which at various times has bought consciences with gold, and when they have resisted this shameful bait, has employed dragoons and scaffolds;—that worldly church, some of whose leaders, notwithstanding their pretended infallibility, have, "by their vices," (said the most distinguished of their own doctors, Möhler), "and by their scandalous pretensions, extinguished the smoking flax they ought to have revived, and deserved that *hell* should swallow them." It is the want of criticism which has allowed that title to be given to the Popes which only belongs to the true Church, that of the pillar of truth! Reject that daring pretension, and submit exclusively to Jesus Christ, the only King of His people.

Go farther still. Strike with the sword of true criticism those false ornaments of religion, those superstitious fables so

fondly cherished in certain countries and in certain religious sects, over which imagination exercises its control. Throw aside those religious novelties, those church paintings, that architectural religion, those symbols, those myths, those relics, those false miracles, those mechanical prayers, those endless repetitions, that creature worship, and the adoration of that Blessed Virgin, who might well shed abundance of tears before the throne of her Saviour, at finding herself the object of a fatal idolatry. Throw away those religious practices which Roman Catholics have borrowed partly from Paganism, and which a certain school in the churches separated from Rome would again borrow from Rome itself. It is for want of criticism that these parasitical plants have grown around the plant of the Lord, and have almost stifled it. "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Thus—cut off, prune, root out—you will be doing the will of God.

Strike with the sword of true criticism that exterior, carnal, materialist tendency, which ruins the most spiritual doctrines, by giving them corporeal and visible forms—the doctrine, for instance, of a real presence and partaking of Jesus Christ, materialised into the host. Oppose the importance ascribed to the *opus operatum*—that is to say, to the external action in the sacrament; oppose those legal, ritual, mechanical acts—that raising of the host, those bowings and kneelings—all those childish tricks placed instead of the law of the Spirit of Life. All these gradually degrade the spiritual religion of Jesus into a fatal materialism—the great danger of Roman Catholic countries. Several Popes, such as John XXIII., Alexander VI., and Leo X. (the latter under a more elegant form) were great materialists. It was in France, a Roman Catholic country, that the philosophical materialism of the Encyclopædists was formed. It is still, in our own days, in such countries that the materialist systems of socialism and communism number most followers. Resist this evil with courage, even in the very midst of Protestantism; for this tendency to sensualism, which is favoured by the Romish Church and opposed by the Protestant, belongs, in general, to the essence of sinful man. In resisting it, you will follow the example of your Master, who attacked it, in His day, at Capernaum, when He said, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh

profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you they are spirit, and they are life."—(John vi. 63.)

Also, if you have one hand turned against Rationalism, you must have a second turned against Romanism—building up when the former destroys, pulling down when the latter heaps up.

You see, dear brethren, that two great duties, springing from two fundamental laws, ought to distinguish the theologian and the Christian at all times, but especially in these our times. *Submission* as to God and His Word, and *examination* as to men and their opinions—these two duties must now be more generally and extensively performed. There must be submission, entire submission—there must be criticism, extensive criticism. If I succeed in impressing these two duties on the conscience and on the will of my young brethren, I shall have reason to be thankful to God for my journey. You invited me, dear brethren, and I came. I came, not without sacrificing other duties to this one, but I came because I believed your call was from God; and now, when about to cease speaking before you, two contradictory feelings agitate my breast. I could wish, and it is my first feeling, not to have come amongst you in vain, and, as Paul wrote to the Romans (i. 11), wish "that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift." But—and this is my second sentiment—I feel sadly my own deficiency. When I think of the barbarous sound your language must have coming from my lips, I ask myself why I came *so far*, since I can do *so little?* But, brethren, if I can do nothing, you, by the grace of God, may do much. I have no persuasive words to attract you, but what I can do is to express my wishes to you.

The first joy which my journey could procure for me would be to see new and intimate relations spring up between the evangelical Christians of the city of Calvin and British Presbyterians; I say *British*, because I love to see but one Presbyterian family in these islands. When the Lord sends one of His servants from one country to another, it is to unite those who love Him in closer bonds. This wish of my heart I place before you.

My second wish is for Christian life amongst you. We must realise the real presence of Jesus Christ. Our Christianity must be personal. We have to do with a Person—a Person who is God and man—a Person whom we must love. The last words

of our Lord were, *Lo, I am with you alway.* Let us remember them. The Romish party in Ireland has just given you a good example. You have no more an Irish party, as in the time of O'Connell; you have a Roman one. They have made a movement; they have changed their position; and they adhere now to their head—in Rome. Protestants of Ireland, do make such a movement, and adhere now, with all your heart, to your Head —in heaven. Be in a closer communion with Him. There is your strength.

My third wish is for your Church. The Church of Rome is a Church of forms, of death; our Evangelical Church must be a Church of spirit, of life. With them the priest is all in all; but in the true Church every Christian is a priest of the living God. We must have offices amongst us—πρεσβυτεροι, or ἐπισκοποι—ministers, elders, deacons; I am decidedly opposed to exclusive clericalism, not only in Romanism, but also in Episcopacy and in Presbyterianism. In the new epoch of the Christian Church, universal sacerdotalism must be more prevalent. Not only elders, called in the Scripture bishops and presbyters, must have a gift of God, and take a part in the edification of the Church, but also, my young brethren, you must distinguish in your congregations every converted Christian who has received some spiritual grace; you must cherish that talent; you must have special prayer-meetings with such brethren, and more general meetings, where, according to the apostolical precept, they may employ the gifts of the Spirit for common edification. We must have in a Church, not only obedience to Scripture and soundness of doctrine, but also life—spiritual life and spiritual action—not only in ministers and elders, but also in the whole body.

My fourth wish is for your country. Methinks I see the Ireland of the former ages, and the Ireland of the present day, at the same time before me. I seem to discern in ancient Ireland, in the midst of Erin's green pastures, about the year *three hundred and eighty-eight*, at the very time when Jerome, Augustin, Chrysostom had hardly begun to perceive the heavenly light, a swineherd tending his swine. His head leans upon his breast, he sighs and sheds tears, he thinks of sin and of a Saviour. *Ibi Dominus aperuit sensum incredulitatis meæ*—"It was there the

Lord opened my unbelieving heart, and, though late, I remembered my sins, and turned to the Lord with all my soul." It is Patrick. If, after having contemplated this bright light in the fourth and fifth centuries—if, after having passed through dark ages of superstition, troubles, and suffering—I reach the present time, I rejoice at the labour of love which our brethren in the Church of England, and you, Irish Presbyterians, have performed. But I ask more. Romish writers, on the Continent, say and repeat, in their controversies, that English Protestantism has made Ireland poor and miserable. We long to be able to show them that Protestantism makes Ireland prosperous and happy. I ask, if the revival which took place in Patrick ought not now to take place in every Irishman? I ask, when will those who invoke St. Patrick and the Virgin receive in their hearts the faith that was in the heart of the Virgin and of Patrick? The greatest victory for the Gospel in our century would be the conquest of Ireland, so superstitious, and so unhappy on account of its superstition.

Presbyterians of Ireland, you must take the lead in the work of renovation. We see, in England, how people who depart from Scripture are doing a work of demolition. Let us see, in Ireland, how people who adhere to Scripture do a work of edification. Build up Ireland again on Christ, the chief corner-stone. Free your country from the errors which have humbled her, and restore her to her place among Christian nations, by the power of God. This is the fourth wish I present to you.

Shall I express to you a last one? Shall I tell you of my thoughts as I journeyed towards you? I said—A new era is opening upon the human race. The great antichristian powers are vigorously attacked. Islamism is hanging over a gulf. India begins to shake at the presence of the Cross. China itself pronounces the name of Jesus Christ. A command is thus addressed to the Church, to take possession of the ends of the earth in the name of the Prince of Peace.

Who will respond to this appeal? Will it be the Roman Catholic Church? Let us listen to the answer of a Roman Catholic. "One is stupified," says Michel Chevalier, of Paris, "to see how much more powerful the Protestant nations are than the Catholics. England and the United States, both Protestant

powers, have assumed, on an unexampled scale, dominion over boundless countries, already densely peopled, or destined to become so. Has, then, Catholic civilisation nothing to do but to go down to the grave?" He consoles himself by adding—"Catholic civilisation is retreating, but it is not routed." A poor consolation!

It behoves Protestant nations, then, to respond to the appeal for the conversion of the world.

But, again, who will do so among these?

Shall it be rationalism? It has never sent out a single missionary.

Shall traditionary Christianity do so? Not only will the baggage with which it is encumbered impede its march, but the neglect of vital doctrines, and the importance which it attaches to exterior, legal, mechanical acts, to the detriment of the power of the Word, render it incapable of being an instrument of regeneration.

To you, then, Evangelical Christians!—to you, who submit to the two great principles of obedience and inquiry—to you we must look for a response to the appeal.

Great Britain must stand firm upon the ground of the Word of God. She forms the centre of the line of battle in the army of Jesus Christ. If she give way, it is to be feared that all will give way. Let her close around the standard of faith, and boldly advance.

Let those even who have diverged towards traditionalism, or rationalism, be aware that, by these systems, they arrest the triumphs of the cause of Jesus Christ, and even compromise the fate of Great Britain. Let them re-unite around the Word of God, and go forward—forward to conquer the earth for the Lord.

This, dear brethren, is the last wish which I shall express to you. To hasten its fulfilment I make use of no eloquent words, but I simply place it before my brethren.

Friends of Christ, to whom I address myself, will you not, at least, do something where I can do nothing.

O Thou, who canst alone grant the fulfilment of our desires, baptise us with fire, as Thou didst Thine apostles of old, to conquer the world for Thy cross! O Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, bless the Irish Presbyterian College, teach its teachers, and

the following extract from the second volume of *Southey's "Life of Wesley," pp.* 384—391, where it is quoted, and affirmed to be "one of the most able and eloquent of all Wesley's Discourses; a triumphant specimen of empassioned argument."

"Call it by whatever name you please," said he, attacking the Calvinistic doctrine, "Election, Preterition, Predestination, or Reprobation, it comes to the same thing. The sense is plainly this: by virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, one part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned, it being impossible that any of the former should be damned, or that any of the latter should be saved." He proceeded to show that it made all preaching vain, as needless to the elect, and useless to the reprobate, and therefore that it could not be a doctrine of God, because it makes void his ordinances: that it tended to produce spiritual pride in some, absolute despair in others, and to destroy our zeal for good works: that it made revelation contradictory and useless; and that it was full of blasphemy,—"of such blasphemy," said he, "as I should dread to mention, but that the honour of our gracious God, and the cause of truth, will not suffer me to be silent. In the cause of God," he pursues, "and from a sincere concern for the glory of his great name, I will mention a few of the horrible blasphemies contained in this horrible doctrine. But, first, I must warn every one of you that hears, as he will answer at the great day, not to charge me, as some have done, with blasphemy, because I mention the blasphemy of others. And the more you are grieved with them that do thus blaspheme, see that ye 'conform your love towards them' the more, and that your heart's desire, and continual prayer to God be, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

"This premised, let it be observed, that this doctrine represents our blessed Lord, 'Jesus Christ the righteous, the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth,' as an hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity. For it cannot be denied that he every where speaks as if he were willing that all men should be saved; therefore, to say he was not willing that all men should be saved, is to represent him as a mere hypocrite and dissembler. It cannot be denied, that the gracious words which came out of his mouth are full of invitations to all sinners; to say, then, he did not *intend* to save all sinners, is to represent him as a gross deceiver of the people. You cannot deny that he says, 'Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden.' If, then, you say he calls those that cannot come, those whom he knows to be unable to come, those whom he can make able to come, but will not, how is it possible to describe greater insincerity? You represent him as mocking his helpless creatures, by offering what he never intends o give. You describe him as saying one thing and meaning another; as pretending the love which he had not. Him in whose mouth was no guile, you make full of deceit, void of common sincerity: then,

There are, besides, many here who are friends of our theological education, and to them we make our appeal this day. We are endeavouring to construct a well, whence will be drawn living waters through coming generations. We ask you to help us in this work. We are thankful to you for the measure of help you have thought proper to give us; and we trust that out of the well we are engaged in constructing, there will, in the generations to come, be drawn streams of living water to refresh, and fertilise, and bless our own country, and in blessing it, to bless the whole world, so that our land may again become what once it was, in the providence and under the grace of God—an island of saints. I cannot think of detaining you after the time that you have already spent with us to-day. I therefore sit down by announcing that a collection will now be made by those noblemen and gentlemen who have kindly undertaken to discharge the duty.

When the collection had been taken up, Dr. Edgar rose and said—There has been committed to me the duty of offering to this meeting a motion of thanks to Dr. Merle D'Aubigné—a duty which I, with great delight and pleasure, undertake, because, having been one of a deputation sent to Dr. D'Aubigné to solicit his attendance here, and having conducted a correspondence with him, I have had full opportunity of knowing that exceeding great kindness he has manifested in complying with our wish, and the great sacrifice which he has made to testify his high regard for the Irish Presbyterian Church, and his deep anxiety for the promotion of the best interests of its young ministers. Feeling, then, myself most thankful, and being fully aware of the deep obligation under which my brethren of the Presbyterian Church believe themselves to be laid, it is my honour and my happiness now to move—That the warmest thanks of this meeting are due and are hereby given to the Rev. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné, for his disinterested Christian kindness, in coming so far, at such a season, and at such personal inconvenience, and for the powerful, talented, evangelical, and effective address which he has delivered—an address reflecting the highest honour upon its author, and admirably calculated to effect extensive, permanent, immortal good. May God bless him.

Thomas M'Clure, Esq., rose to second the motion. He said—We must all feel a deep sense of gratitude to the illustrious stranger who has come so far to honour us with his presence, and to sustain our cause by his powerful advocacy. The promotion of means by which an educated ministry may be continued in this land is worthy of this great man. His spirit-stirring address will long be remembered by all who have been privileged to hear it. His presence among us this day, at the opening of the College, is truly an auspicious event, and I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my rev. friend, Dr. Edgar.

Rev. Dr. Cooke then rose and said—I feel it unnecessary to take the ordinary mode of putting this motion, that you may express your will concerning it; but, nevertheless, inasmuch as it is a custom, I must, to a certain extent, I suppose, adhere to it, and ask those who are of opinion that this motion should pass, to submit themselves to our Presbyterian plan of holding up their right hands. [The hands of all, ladies and gentlemen, were held up.]

Dr. Cooke was just about to convey the thanks of the meeting to Dr. D'Aubigné, when

Dr. D'Aubigné rose and said—I will only say, I thank you sincerely. If an honour has been conferred on any side, it has been on mine.

Rev. Dr. Cooke—I have great pleasure now, without putting a motion, in the name of the faculty of our Presbyterian College, and in the name of our friends who have been so active and so generous in our support, of returning our hearty thanks to those noblemen and gentlemen who have so kindly attended and acted as collectors to-day, and to those friends, especially, from other churches, who have come and given us at once their countenance and their aid. I have at all times sought in this land what I see around me to-day—a Protestant union; and we have had pleasing evidence to-day before us, I am happy to say it, of the union of the two great Protestant Churches of Ulster. I see present one who well represents that Church to which I do not belong, with a great number of friends around him representing a Church to which, though I do not belong in outward form, I belong in every principle of good-will, and in adherence to that evangelical doctrine which, I trust, we are, in the providence of God, not merely permitted to profess, but also privileged to propagate, until it shall impress the whole land. I, therefore, in the name of the faculty, and of our Committee, beg to return thanks to those noblemen and gentlemen who have assisted us to-day as collectors, and to all our friends, and especially to those of the Established Church who have given us this day their countenance and aid. I now call upon the Rev. Dr. Brown of Aghadoey to conclude with devotional exercises.

The Rev. Dr. Brown accordingly engaged in prayer, and, having pronounced the benediction, the proceedings of the day terminated, and the assembly separated.

The subscriptions in hand, the price of the tickets, and the collection taken in the Church, amounted to £700 of the £1000 required. The collectors on the occasion were—the Earl of Roden, Lord-Viscount Massareene and Ferrard, Dr. Magee, Mayor of Belfast, General Thomas, Richard Davison, Esq., M.P., William Kirk, Esq., M.P., Newry; William S. Crawford, Esq. C. R. Dobbs, Esq., R. B. B. Houston, Esq., S. G. Fenton, Esq.,

James Gibson, Esq., Assistant-Barrister for Queen's County, Alexander Montgomery, Esq., Thomas Montgomery, Esq., W. B. Price, Esq., John F. Ferguson, Esq., John Bates, Esq., John Thomson, Esq., Low-wood, and Frederick Lewis, Esq., Mayor-Elect.

FORM OF BEQUEST TO THE BELFAST PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE.

I GIVE and bequeath to the Faculty, for the time being, of the Belfast Presbyterian College, in trust for the use of said Institution, the sum of _____, to be paid out of my chattels personal: the said sum to be expended in [purchasing books for the Library of said College; in founding a Bursary for the encouragement of deserving Students; *or in such other way as the testator may prefer;*] the said Bequest to be given free, and discharged from legacy-duty, and the receipt of the Secretary of the said Faculty for the time being to be a sufficient discharge to my executors for said Bequest.

BELFAST; PRINTED BY M'CORMICK AND ROBIE, BANNER OF ULSTER OFFICE.

LETTER

TO THE

REV. WILLIAM D. KILLEN, D.D.

ON HIS

DEFENCE OF JOHN CALVIN,

IN THE CASE OF

MICHAEL SERVETUS.

BY J. SCOTT PORTER.

LONDON:
EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.

1854.

LETTER

TO THE

REV. W. D. KILLEN, D.D.

Belfast, 25th February, 1854.

Reverend Sir,

The respect in which I hold your personal character and your position in the church to which you belong, will not permit me to pass over your strictures on my *Servetus and Calvin*, as if they were altogether unworthy of notice. But a very brief reply will suffice; because you leave every important statement of mine, respecting the history and fate of Servetus, and the treatment which he experienced at the hands of "the Great Reformer," exactly where you found it. You entitle your work a *Defence of Calvin*; yet you either expressly or by necessary implication admit the truth of every weighty fact alleged against him, on which you have thought proper to touch; while several very grave and serious charges you pass over in total silence. This is not to defend Calvin, but to leave him without defence. One or two points of trivial importance in my *Lectures* you attempt to controvert; some others of the same general description you bring forward, though not alluded to by me: in both cases you are frequently mistaken. But I acquit you of wilful misrepresentation, as you appear to be very imperfectly acquainted with the original authorities bearing on the case. You seem not to have read Calvin's defence of himself, nor his letters, nor Beza's elaborate justification of intolerance. Your principal sources are *Rilliet*, *Paul Henry* and the *Bibliotheca Sacra;* all of them modern and one-sided writers. In fact, you seem to know but little even of the modern literature of the question, else you would never have called P. Henry "the most *recent* biographer of Calvin." So little do you appear to know of the times of which you write, that you confound the "Venerable Company of Pastors" with the "Consistory" of Geneva; two institutions as distinct as the College of Cardinals and the Inquisition at Rome. (*Defence*, &c., p. 14, n. §). Had you known your subject matter better, you would have disputed my statements even less frequently than you have done, and saved me some trouble.

But, Reverend Sir, your pamphlet shews a want much more deeply to be deplored than any deficiency of knowledge. It shews a want of humane feeling and Christian sympathy with a fellow-man, whom you cannot but acknowledge to have been wrongfully apprehended, imprisoned, and put to a horrid death, for no other crime than that of avowing his conscientious convictions in matters of religious faith. Seeing that you give your judgment, though in a guarded form, against "the views" of Calvin "as to the civil punishment of heretics," (*Def.* p. 24,) I thought you must in some place or other have expressed some feeling akin to compassion for the unfortunate Servetus, who was made the victim of those "views" of "the Great Reformer." The circumstances are calculated to awaken compassion in any breast not hardened into stone by the fell agency of sectarian animosity; but in your whole pamphlet, there is not, from beginning to end, one word of pity or regret for his unjust and horrid fate. On the contrary, you never speak of him without adding some term of hatred, loathing, and contempt. You find vent for your feelings towards him in such language only as the following, applied, be it remembered, to one of the most illustrious men of the sixteenth century—the discoverer of the circulation of the blood—the author of the famous treatise, *De Syroporum Ratione*, and of other works which attracted the attention of all the scientific men in Europe, then and long afterwards:—"*one of the most contemptible of mortals;*" "*fiendish;*" "*scurrilous Unitarian;*" "*impudent;*" "*hypocrite;*" "*repeatedly convicted of hypocrisy and perjury;*" "*the blackest perjury;*" "*most intolerable insolence;*" "*abominable liar;*" "*the vilest miscreant;*" "*gross, incorrigible and false-hearted blasphemer;*" "*loathsome,*" &c., &c., &c. Such are the only epithets you can find to couple with the name of this illustrious man, doomed, living and dead, to be the object of Calvinistic intolerance and malignity! Sir, you have been pleased to express something like a hope that I may be brought to see in Calvinism, "a truth that can sanctify and save." Judging of the tree by this specimen of its fruit, I can discern no evidence of its power to do either. These are not the feelings of a sanctified soul; and the heart in which they reside requires yet to be regenerated unto the likeness of Christ. If I can only be a Calvinist by giving an entrance to emotions of this nature with regard to the most mistaken of sufferers for conscience-sake, let me assure you that Calvinism is less than ever the creed for me!

So much, Reverend Sir, for the spirit of your *Defence of Calvin*; let me now briefly examine its substance, in the chronological order of the facts.

1. I have said that Calvin, "while living on the benefices which he held in the Romish Church, and preaching beside her altars, cherished the most unmitigated detestation of many of her doctrines and observances;" and that this implied, "concealment of his opinions." I have added that "when he resolved to abandon her communion, he first transferred one of his livings to a kinsman of his own, which involved an act of gross hypocrisy; and then sold another for

money, which was an act of simony." (*Lectures*, p. 56.) Part of this you deny. You say that "Calvin, as soon as he became a Protestant, *openly avowed* his new faith." (*Def.* p. 8. n.) But you cannot be ignorant that an avowal of Protestantism would lead to the immediate forfeiture of his livings. Now he held these livings, and was doing all that was necessary to retain them, at the time when he challenged Servetus to a discussion, as he tells us he did: (*Def. Orth. Fid.*, p. 6.) and at that time you yourself assert that he was a Protestant. (*Def.* p. 8.) Nor did he part with them till the 4th of May, 1534: (*Drelincourt*, p. 215;) before which time he had undoubtedly become a Protestant, as it occurred after the affair of Cop. If you can prove to me that the ecclesiastical tribunals would permit him to give away one living to a friend and part with another for money, while he was not merely a suspected but an "*avowed*" Protestant, you will shew them to have acted towards the Reformers, with an open-hearted liberality *for which they have never yet got credit!* Meanwhile I retain my opinion that there must have been some degree of concealment in the case. You admit there was simony: but you say it was done while Calvin "was to a great extent unenlightened." Of course I do not deny this: for I hold that he "was, to a great extent, unenlightened" as long as he lived: but surely, Sir, he was *as much a Protestant in conviction* as he ever was; and, after all, does the nature of a crime change with the doctrinal belief of the criminal? Is simony no sin in a Catholic? You cite a passage from Calvin in which he himself describes "as a horrible sin" the "*buying and selling of spiritual promotions which prevailed under the papacy.*" Is not this a striking condemnation of his own crime, uttered by his own mouth, and recorded by his own hand?

2. I have accused Calvin of having written a letter to Farel, in A.D. 1546, seven years before Servetus came to Geneva, declaring that if he should come thither he would use all his influence to prevent him from leaving it alive: *this you expressly admit to be true.* (*Def.* p. 13.) I have accused Calvin of keeping this murderous intention secret from the intended victim: this you deny. You say he had *no such intention* as his words express. But here permit me to say, Calvin's actions are more conclusive than your surmises, and you have nothing else in favour of your assertion. Is it unreasonable to suppose, that when a man first declares a certain purpose, and then carries it into effect, he really meant to do what he declared he would do? You say that Calvin "must have been an uncommonly candid murderer, for a man who designs to take away the life of a fellow creature, seldom gives so long notice of his intentions." There would be some force in this, if the letter expressing his determination to put Servetus to death, had been sent *to himself*, and not to Farel, a man with whom it is apparent he never had any intercourse till the day of his being committed to the flames; the man, too, who was more eager than Calvin himself, to have him subjected to the torturing fire! Oh but you *guess* that Calvin *may have written* to Servetus to

the same effect; not, of course, that he had any notion—not the least—of *actually* putting him to death! but just to prevent him from coming to Geneva, where his presence would be disagreeable. When Calvin, as you say, "declared that if he came to Geneva, and if his authority availed anything, he would not suffer him to go away alive, *he*, NO DOUBT, *deprecated most earnestly* the presence of the restless heresiarch." (*Def.* p. 13.) You, Sir, have "*no doubt*" on this point. I have very strong doubts; in fact it seems to me utterly incredible. Recollect, Sir, that *no historian has recorded or suspected any such communication*. You are, I believe, the first writer, living or dead, who even surmised its existence. Remember that we have a letter from Calvin to Frellon, who forwarded all those that passed between Calvin and Servetus, written on the very same day (13th February, 1546) with that to Farel, manifestly intended to be shewn to Servetus, *but expressing no such bloody purpose;* that it would have been a fact in the case, sure to have been dwelt on by Servetus, in the course of his trial at Geneva, and afterwards to have been urged by Calvin in his apology for procuring him to be put to death, yet that neither of them has once alluded to any such communication; and you will confess that, of all historical conjectures, this is the most ridiculous and absurd. Sir, if criminals are to be allowed to escape the odium and infamy which attach to their crimes by virtue of such unproved, improbable, and self contradictory surmises as this, which of all the monsters recorded in history may not be transformed into a hero and a saint? Is it not a bad symptom of the case of Calvin, that he can only be defended by unfounded and unauthorised conjectures?

3. I now come to the case at Vienne. You admit (*Def. p.* 10.) that Servetus was denounced before the Inquisition there in consequence of a letter from a certain William Trie, a French Protestant residing at Geneva, and intimate with Calvin, to a Catholic friend named Arneys, at Lyons, reproaching the Catholics in that part of France for allowing to live unmolested among them a certain Spaniard, calling himself *Villeneuve*, but really named *Servetus*, who had revived all the reveries of the ancient heretics, and who had secretly printed, at the press of B. Arnoullet, a book, (of which he inclosed a portion,) full of the most horrid blasphemies. You assert indeed that "Trie *had no idea* that any use would be made of this letter:" (*Def. p.* 10:) which shews you have never read it; for never was letter more manifestly or more skilfully constructed to produce a given effect, than this one was to procure the apprehension of Servetus by the Inquisition. You assert that in consequence of this first letter, Servetus "was *arrested*," (*ib.*) which is not true; he was summoned and examined, and his lodgings searched; but nothing decisive appeared against him, and he was left at large. But, at the instigation of the Inquisitor, Arneys applied to Trie for the remainder of the book of which a part had been forwarded, hoping that it might furnish more conclusive proof. The answer of Trie is extant. He regrets that he

cannot send the document which was asked for: but says that he incloses what is far more convincing, two dozen of pieces written by the hand of the person in question, which he cannot deny: and which will leave the Inquisitors "without excuse, if they dissemble or delay, the fact being now fully proved." These "pieces" were *letters written by Servetus to Calvin*, and containing the most open and explicit avowal of his heretical sentiments. Trie says he had *got them from Calvin*, for the express purpose of being laid before the Inquisition as grounds for the conviction of Servetus; that Calvin had, at first, felt extreme reluctance to give them up for this purpose; but had at last consented to do so, rather than subject him to the charge of "*levity!*" All this, Sir, you *expressly admit*, with the exception of the last word, which you mistranslate. (*ib.*) Servetus was now apprehended and lodged in prison, whence in a few days he made his escape; but was found guilty in his absence, and sentenced to the flames. Not one syllable of all this do you deny; but you conceive I am mistaken in supposing that Calvin "*originated* this prosecution." That, let me tell you, is a matter of very subordinate importance. I retain my opinion upon it: and think I have given in my *Lectures*, (pp. 12, 15,) reasons which will convince any impartial historian that I am right. But the main point is, whether Calvin did not, *by giving up the letters of Servetus for this bloody use*, make himself the spy and the informer of the Popish Inquisition, and the author of the murder of Servetus at Vienne, if he had been put to death on that occasion; as he would infallibly have been but for his escape from prison? I am ashamed to think that a Protestant divine in the middle of the nineteenth century should dream of defending Calvin's conduct in this particular. Calvin himself was ashamed of it; and sought to get rid of the odium by an *equivocal*, or (since you will have it so, *Def.* p. 15,) an *unequivocal* denial. Let us see, however, what it was that Calvin denied. Look to his own statement, (*Def. Orth. Fid.* p. 34.) "Many say it ill became me to expose Servetus to the professed enemies of Christ, as to furious beasts: for they affirm it was through my interference, (*meâ operâ*) that he was arrested at Vienne in the province of Lyons." This is what Calvin really, or in appearance denies: *but not one word of it do* YOU *dare to dispute!* With the letters of Trie, and the sentence of the Tribunal before you, expressly grounding the condemnation of Servetus on his "letters and writings under his own hand addressed to Mr. John Calvin, preacher at Geneva," (you have the latter in your friend Rilliet by Tweedie, p. 240,) you dare not and you do not venture to deny that Calvin did actually "expose Servetus to those furious beasts" the Inquisitors; still less that it was "through his interference," and by his means that that unfortunate man was arrested at Vienne. Granting, then, that you are right in affirming that Calvin "denied this charge most distinctly," what does his denial prove, but that the "Great Reformer" most distinctly and deliberately uttered a wilful falsehood! And this may serve for an answer to your silly challenge in the next line, "*we defy Mr. Porter, or any man in existence, to prove*

that the Reformer EVER DELIBERATELY STATED WHAT HE BELIEVED TO BE UNTRUE." (*Def.* p. 11.) You defy me to prove this! *Why, Sir, you have just proved it yourself!*

But I have accused Calvin of "treacherously" giving up a private and confidential correspondence for the abominable purpose of betraying to death the man who had unbosomed his soul to him, confiding in his honour and integrity. You deny that the correspondence was private and confidential. But, Sir, any man of honour will feel that letters which exposed the life of their author to inevitable destruction, letters which their author was permitted to continue to send, one after another, for a series of years, though every one of them imperilled his head, *were private and confidential on their very face:* and to produce them against him before a criminal tribunal where his life was at stake, was the act of an assassin. You tell us truly that Calvin affirmed that *one* of the letters, (you are wrong in saying several,) was written "*as if to gibe him.*" I have given that letter at full length, (*Lectures* p. 10, n.) You will find it vain to try to extract a gibe or taunt of any kind, out of a communication so serious and respectful; nor did Calvin himself look on it as an insult at the time; for he immediately sat down and wrote an elaborate reply; and as he certainly answered the last letter in the series, (*see his letter to Frellon above cited,*) there is every probability that every one of Servetus' epistles had received its own reply. Who could expect to find such a correspondence forwarded *without notice*, that it might convict the writer of the crime of heresy before the Inquisition, and so, to use the words of William Trie, "purge the Christian world of such filth and deadly pest?" You rely apparently on the fact of the letters (*or others to the same effect:* Calvin seems to intimate that they were not the same; *ex triginta epistolis, quas* VELUT AD ME SCRIPTAS *in publicum edidit, Def. Orth. Fid.* p. 8:) having been already printed by Servetus. But, Sir, how were they printed? Secretly: anonymously: with no clue to the writer's name, except that which could be furnished by Calvin himself. This clue he was not even asked to give; but he volunteered to give it! Here I leave the notions of Calvin and his defender, Doctor Killen, on the laws of honourable confidence, and the nature and the disgrace of treachery! I shall only reply to your assertion that "Calvin was *the last man in Europe* to whom the Inquisitors would have paid any attention," by saying,—Look to the sentence passed by the Inquisition upon Servetus, and you will find that they condemned him upon testimony laid before them by *this same Calvin*, as they themselves state, referring to him *formally, expressly, and by name!* You think, Sir, I might have gone in safety through France at that time, on the strength of my *Lectures* on Servetus and Calvin: but with the case of Servetus before my eyes, I apprehend there would be some likelihood of my being burnt, had Calvin thought proper to denounce *me*, as he did his old friend and comrade! It is easy for you, my dear Sir, to invent guesses as to what might or might not have been the case in the 16th century; but one stubborn fact like this outweighs them all!

4. And now we come to the apprehension, trial, and execution of Servetus at Geneva; and it is right we should be careful in our statement of the facts; because, to use the words of your great authority, Dr. P. Henry, "*it is* HERE *that Calvin appears* IN HIS TRUE CHARACTER." (Vol. ii. p. 160.) I have stated, on the authority of Calvin, (*Epistolæ*, p. 114, ed. 1575,) and of Servetus, (*Exam. 17th, 23d, and 28th of August,*) that the latter arrived in Geneva, as a fugitive, on the evening of the day preceding his arrest. You affirm that he probably was "about the city and neighbourhood for a considerable time," and in "secret correspondence with the enemies of the Reformer;" you say that he appeared "in the most public places of resort;" and you even censure me for condemning the notorious lie advanced by Spon, though contradicted by his own annotator, that he "began to disseminate his opinions in the city." (*Def.* pp. 13, 14.) Now, Sir, does it not strike you as a thing very strange that Servetus should have been so long in Geneva, frequenting the most public places of resort,—corresponding with the enemies of the Reformer, (over whom the latter kept strict watch, as the records shew,)—and busily disseminating his opinions, while, nevertheless, his presence should have been unknown, and even unsuspected, by Calvin, by Beza, by the Company of Pastors, or by the court which tried him? You quote *a mere hearsay*, repeated by Rilliet, that "he was arrested in consequence of his appearing in one of the churches;" and you think no weight is due to his own declaration,—so easily contradicted if false,—yet *altogether uncontradicted* by any one who took part against him,—that he remained in his inn, (the Rose,) from the hour of his entering the city till that of his arrest. But let this pass, for it is of little importance compared with what follows. You grant that it was *Calvin* who informed one of the syndics of the presence of Servetus, and procured his arrest. Little merit is due to your concession, for Calvin himself expressly tells us it was; but you pass over, *in ominous silence*, the fact that the *information was given and the arrest made on the Lord's Day!* Yes, Sir, it was on Sunday, the 13th of August, 1553, that your sainted Calvin,—your man of "consecrated intellect,"—your "Great Reformer,"—after preaching and praying in the church, became a second time the informer against Servetus, who had broken through the snare laid for him at Vienne; and caused him to be seized, in order to be put to death! Sir, you dare not contradict this:—then why do you pass it over? Why, but for the same reason which induces you to pass over so many other points in the case,—that you want to keep out of sight as many as possible of those transactions in which "Calvin appears in his true character!" Is this, Sir, the part of a historian who prefers the *truth* to the *reputation of any man?* Or were you afraid that the avowal of the fact might occur to some of your readers as an awkward tail-piece to a sermon on the "Bill for the better Observance of the Sabbath?" The culprit, so long and so eagerly expected, having now been lodged in prison by the man whose vow was registered,

"never, if his own influence availed, to allow him to depart alive," —it was next needful that a prosecutor should appear against him; and as Calvin was the real author of his arrest, it was but fair and just that he should take the responsibility of his own act, by publicly, before the tribunal, in the face of Geneva and the world, stepping forth in that capacity. But by the law of Geneva, the prosecutor was bound to go to prison along with the culprit during the first stage of the trial; and as you express it, Calvin "could spend his time more profitably:" (we shall soon see *how*:) and accordingly he put forward in his place, one Nicolas de la Fontaine, an inmate of his house, as he (Calvin) himself tells us,—his "servant," as he calls him; who is expressly called by a contemporary writer, (who attacked Calvin on this account,) "*Calvin's cook*;" an inmate of his "*kitchen*;" and a grossly "*ignorant man*." Sir, it is remarkable that although this attack was published in the very next year, 1554, and although it was well known to both Calvin and Beza, (who take every occasion to revile Castalio, its supposed author, in terms of the most unmitigated abuse,) yet neither of them has accused him of the slightest misrepresentation on this point. Under these circumstances most people would regard the point as settled; but you have views of your own respecting historical evidence. You reject all these testimonies, and affirm that Nicolas was "a gentleman," a "man of letters" and a "student of theology;" "secretary to Calvin," &c: but for these assertions you produce no other reason than that "every one knows that Calvin had little occasion for such a functionary" as a cook. (*Def.* p. 15.) Alas, Sir, how unfortunate are your conjectures! Look to your great authority, Paul Henry, and you will find that *this very Nicolas*, (whom however he represents like you as a student, secretary, &c.) was actually in Calvin's house as "*cook*" at the time of the Sieur de Bourgogne's visit; that is, just two years before! (*Life of Calvin*, vol. ii. p. 193.) Calvin, therefore, contrary to your conjecture, did actually keep a real live cook; and this "gentleman," as you call him, Nicolas de la Fontaine, did really and truly live with him in that capacity, in the year 1551. Pray, Sir, have you any evidence to shew that he had been promoted to a secretary-ship in the interval? Meanwhile, I adhere to my description of him as a *lickplate:* a term which I use, not to express any contempt for domestic servants, as such; few men, I venture to say, are more respectful to those among them with whom I have any intercourse; but on account of this man's meanness in allowing himself to be made a tool for effecting his employer's bad purposes: and every one must see that the contempt was intended to reflect upon the master who used his menial for such a vile service. But I am only wasting time in dwelling on a point of such subordinate importance. The real point is, whether Calvin did not take care that Servetus should be prosecuted by a mere creature and instrument of his own, who could have no will in opposition to his; while he himself, notwithstanding, declined to undergo the inconvenience and responsibility which the law threw

upon the prosecutor. Calvin avows that he sent this wretched tool forward as a prosecutor in his own stead; that he had "hired" him to appear as such,—and that he drew up the indictment which Nicolas presented to the court. In this indictment, he was made to declare that he had "raised this criminal action *in his own private and proper name:*"—a declaration which I cannot but describe as a falsehood; but which you, in your impartiality as the defender of John Calvin, represent as perfectly honourable and truthful: *the lovers of truth will judge.* And now the plot begins to thicken, and the difficulties which beset the "*Defence of Calvin*" increase and multiply. The Records of the Court shew that Calvin, in the absence of Servetus, petitioned for and obtained leave to appear against him in person and to bring with him as many others as he pleased for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the prisoner, "that his errors might be the better demonstrated;" and accordingly, he attended every subsequent sitting during the whole of the proceedings. But you rely on his own statement, that he was summoned to this duty by the court—(*Defence*, p. 17.) Suppose this to be true, what Christian minister possessed either of humanity or piety becoming his profession, would have accepted the odious office? In our House of Lords, the Bishops have uniformly absented themselves from the proceedings upon impeachment; feeling that the condemnation of a fellow creature to punishment, even when clearly convicted, was no fitting function for a clergyman to discharge: but the Genevan minister did not think it inconsistent with his calling *to endeavour to procure* the condemnation of Servetus to death, for the simple crime of differing from himself as to the right interpretation of the doctrines of the Gospel! Who can doubt that on this point the Records of the Court are to be believed in preference to the unsupported assertion of Calvin, who was desirous of lessening as much as possible the infamy which his conduct had drawn down upon him? He was not contented with conducting the prosecution in public with all the virulence which belonged to his nature. *He went about among the judges during the adjournment of the Court, and privately laboured to overcome any scruples which they might have felt in condemning the prisoner to death.* So his friend Rilliet states. And you, Sir, a Christian divine of the nineteenth century, though you admit the fact, (*Def. of Calvin*, p. 17,) have not a word to say against this diabolical proceeding! And, Sir, there is worse than this in your pamphlet. You grant that while Servetus lay in prison, awaiting the issue of his trial, Calvin ascended the pulpit of the principal church in Geneva, on the Lord's day, and then and there, in the presence of a numerous auditory, including beyond all reasonable doubt, many or the whole of the judges who were to decide upon the prisoner's fate, delivered a bitter invective against the prisoner, "carefully bringing out, as Rilliet tells us, his impieties and blasphemies, scattering all the excuses with which men tried to conceal his crimes, and reprobating the compassion with which they were pleased to regard him." (*Lectures*, p. 24: *Def.* p. 18.) And of this foul con-

duct, you say "it only supplies evidence of the zeal and fidelity of the Reformer!" And you affirm that "it was his duty" as a "witness to the truth of God, to guide and enlighten the public mind!" What will the honest and true-hearted Presbyterians of Ireland say of such a cause, such a defence, and such a defender! I pass over your attempted parallel between this atrocious proceeding, and the conduct of the Unitarians of Ireland, who laboured, and not without effect, to prevent the respectable laity of the orthodox churches from being drawn in to countenance the robbery of church property which was attempted about ten years ago, on a large scale, by some Presbyterian Ministers and "speculative attornies;" for there is no man so stupid as not to see the difference between openly defending before all the world, our own possessions, and attacking the *life of a fellow-creature*, and that too, *behind his back!* To do you justice, you seem to grow sick of your task as it proceeds; for you pass over, without defence, some very weighty charges advanced against your hero in my Lectures. I have accused him of sending out letters and messengers to gain over to his views the Swiss divines whom the court at Geneva had agreed to consult on the case of Servetus. What reply do you make to this? *Not one word!* the oracle is dumb! I have mentioned the delight which Calvin testified when he found that the Swiss divines had acted as he recommended, and the "*hope*" which he repeatedly expressed, that the sentence would be for death, and the punishment capital. (*Lectures*, p. 29.) What say you to this? Sir, you are silent as the grave. I have shewn that Calvin was able to *predict* the finding of the court,—the sentence of the prisoner,—and the time of his execution; thus proving a collusion between himself and the majority of the judges. (*Lect. ib.*) What says the oracle to this?—Nothing! I have stated, that when Servetus, a few hours before his death, sent for Calvin, and besought his forgiveness for the asperity of his language, the Great Reformer only answered him in terms of invective and reproach. (*L.* p. 30.) What say you to this, Dr. Killen, the Great Defender of "the Great Reformer?" Not a single syllable! I have asserted and proved that after Servetus had undergone the cruel death to which he was sentenced as a "heretic and blasphemer," by being burnt to death, by a slow fire made of green wood, at Champel, near Geneva, on the 27th day of October, 1553,—Calvin, who had vowed his destruction upwards of seven years before, who had first endeavoured to compass his death by giving up his letters to the Inquisition in France, and had afterwards effected his object by the foul means described in this paragraph,—continued to pour out the hatred and malice of his heart against the unhappy victim, by continually writing of him in language of ferocious abuse. (*Lectures*, p. 70-74.) But no word have I been able to elicit from you! Sir, this, as I have already said, is not to defend Calvin, but to leave him without defence; and yet it is to condemn yourself for not openly reprobating what you dare not attempt to defend. I have asserted, and as some careful inquirers have

thought, *proved*, (*Lectures*, p. 66-69) that Calvin in his various writings, has uttered not less than eleven wilful falsehoods, respecting the case of Servetus. On three or four of these you make some weak and ineffectual strictures: on the other points you have attempted no defence. Notwithstanding your foolish challenge already noticed, you seem to think that in Calvin's case, a few falsehoods more or less make no difference: and as I am of the same opinion, I leave your strictures, as you leave the bulk of my charges, to make their own impression.

5. And now, Sir, a few words on the legality of the trial of Servetus, and on his treatment in prison. You have not said a syllable to shew that it is possible to reconcile with the law of nations, the conviction of Servetus at Geneva for an alleged crime committed in France; and yet, unless this be done, all parties concerned in his death were guilty of murder, including the arch-prosecutor, Calvin. You have not brought forward a law, and but the shadow of an argument that there was any law at Geneva, for proceeding *criminally* against any man for heresy in that city: and you take no notice of the weighty arguments which I have adduced to prove that there was none; and yet this likewise is necessary to acquit the prosecutor and the court of a judicial murder. I have shewn, and as I conceive, *proved*, that the law was strained in refusing to the prisoner the benefit of an advocate for which he petitioned, and the right of appeal which he claimed. (*Lectures*, p. 41, 42.) Of the latter point, you *take no notice*; on the former you simply give your own assertion, which would be more valuable if you were better informed and more candid, that "the criminal edicts of Geneva authorised the refusal:" *(which assuredly they do not:)* and the thing being lawful, you seem to imagine that it must of course be right. Yes, Dr. Killen, you have not a word to say against the iniquity of refusing to a foreigner, illegally brought before the court, the benefit of counsel to plead the provisions of the law! For shame! I have shewn that the prisoner was afflicted with the disease of *hernia*, and that the judges knew it: that, nevertheless, they confined him in a damp, cold, and unwholesome dungeon: that they never allowed him to leave his cell *for any purpose whatever*, during the two months and a half of his imprisonment; that his clothes were worn, torn, and rotten; that his linen was unchanged from the day of his arrest; that he was, to use his own expression, "eaten alive" with vermin; and that his apartment and his person were reduced to a condition, which, as he declared, he was unable to set forth in words, without indecency. Sir, the vilest criminal on earth ought not to be treated thus, even while undergoing sentence; much less a man unconvicted of any crime; and to do you justice, you seem to feel it; and accordingly you boldly deny the facts. Yes, Sir, although the truth of these facts was allowed by the court itself, which sat in the very building where the prisoner was confined, and saw him almost daily, and made an order (which was *disobeyed*) for remedying the wrong,—you affirm

that all these allegations are false! And let me tell you, Sir, that I cannot acquit you of endeavouring to mislead the public, when you assert that Servetus "had no difficulty in providing a supply of clothing, as when put into confinement at Geneva, he had about him ninety-seven pieces of gold, as well as some jewels of great value," *concealing the fact that every coin and article of value* had been taken from him at the time of his arrest! *and that not a doit was ever restored!* I have shewn that he was allowed only one sheet of paper when he asked for some to write a petition to the court: this, the able, eloquent, and humane defender of John Calvin, considers quite right! I have shewn that he was not permitted to speak to any individual whatsoever, not even to concert the course to be taken in conducting his defence, nor to a physician; but on this point you wisely say nothing.

6. Such, Sir, was the conduct of John Calvin in the case of Michael Servetus; which you have taken it upon you, at this age of the world's history, to defend before the face of God and men! I am not desirous of using strong language when I can with propriety avoid it; but I feel myself impelled by duty to call upon you seriously to reflect whether by publishing "*A Defence of John Calvin in the case of Michael Servetus,*"—you have not insulted your Maker, and outraged not merely the good feelings but the common sense of your fellow creatures. One thing is quite clear, as long as a state of mind and heart exists which induces you, a Christian minister, a learned theologian, a Doctor of Divinity, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History, to step forth in defence of such man in such a case,—so long is it the solemn duty of all who are acquainted with the dismal facts of this most horrible affair, to keep them before the public mind, to set them forth in their true light,—and to reprobate the condition of heart which induced Calvin to persecute to the death that unfortunate victim of popish and protestant intolerance, and now induces men like you to appeal to the public in defence of the criminal, and palliation of the crime. Sir, your pamphlet is *itself* the triumphant reply to the complaints you have been pleased to make against me, first for lecturing, and afterwards for publishing my discourses on this melancholy case. Your pamphlet proves that my first reason was well founded: namely that "if I,"—a Unitarian,—"did not bring it forward, nobody else,"—that is, no *Calvinist*,—"would." The only utterance that has come from the Calvinistic church is a "*Defence of John Calvin in the case of Servetus, by W. D. Killen, D.D.*" There, Sir, is my complete justification. It proves that there are yet divines to whom the reputation of Calvin is dearer than justice, humanity, truth, freedom, and the precepts of Christianity itself: and it is my duty to guard these, the great interests of mankind, from being injured through the perverse efforts of such men to mislead the public judgment, to justify the offender, and excuse the offence. You have said that my Lectures "exhibit the plainest evidence of passion and prejudice:" (*Def.* p. 5.) and yet, Sir, you have not in one solitary instance been able to establish the misrepresentation,—or the distortion,

—or the suppression of any fact or circumstance belonging to the case: nor to detect one mis-citation or mistake, in that "array of authorities by which my statements are *apparently* authenticated," as you grant: (*ib.*)—by which they are, as I have shewn in every case, established beyond all fair and honest doubt. Sir, are you not ashamed to name the very names of *prejudice and passion?* Can there be plainer proofs of either than your own pamphlet contains? Whatever you may *think* of the necessity which existed for the discussion of the deeply interesting topic, your own work has proved it beyond dispute:—and I thank you for the confirmation of my views on this important point: the only one in my *Lectures* which I looked upon as open to question. Had you written in a different spirit:—had you come forward to avow that the conduct of Calvin towards Servetus was that of a fierce, relentless, and unscrupulous persecutor;—that it was altogether unjustifiable, and unfit for the imitation of any Christian man, no matter what might be the peculiar type of his own creed, or that which he opposed;—that even while recollecting the services which Calvin had performed in defence of what you regard as the orthodox doctrines of the Gospel, you could not be blind to his many errors and defects, both of temper and conduct, nor wish others to overlook them:—that on the contrary, as the errors of a man so much respected are always dangerous,—and as the conduct of Calvin in this instance had notoriously contributed to produce the practice of similar intolerance in almost all the Reformed Churches,—any man was doing good service who set this part of his history in its true light, and guarded the public against following as an example what ought to be shunned as a warning;—had you written in this spirit, you would have given me reason to doubt whether it would not have been better to leave the argument altogether in your hands, or such as yours. But you have so written as to prove the *necessity* for a thorough discussion of the question, and the propriety of my engaging in it. For this, Sir, I beg you to accept my thanks: but I disclaim another debt which you wish me to acknowledge. You think that I owe to a paper of yours in the *Irish Presbyterian*, some statements in my printed *Lectures*, which either were not orally delivered, or were not reported by the newspapers. I have already explained the origin of these additions, (*Lectures, Pref.* p. iv.) and I beg to assure you that I have not till this hour so much as seen a single copy of the *Irish Presbyterian*: nor did I ever hear of its existence till about a week after my *Lectures* were in print. If your Letters in it are similar to your *Defence of Calvin*, I should have *made very copious use* of them.

7. A word or two more on miscellaneous matters; and I shall be done with Calvin for the present. You are right in supposing that it was not inadvertence which led me to omit in my lately published *Lectures*, a narrative which I had incorporated in a former work of mine,—that, of the "Great Reformer" having laughed immoderately on seeing Servetus led out to execution, so that he was even obliged to

conceal his face in his cloak. For this story there is good authority : (Bock, *Historia Antitrinitariorum*, vol. ii. p. 377 :) and there is in it no inherent improbability, if the rest of the proceedings be taken into account. But I did not wish to introduce into *Servetus and Calvin* any matter that could be considered as open to disputation ; and, therefore, I passed it by. As to your attempt to reconcile Calvin's two assertions,—one in a letter written on the 26th October, 1553, affirming that he and his brother ministers had made every effort to get the sentence passed upon Servetus, changed from burning to some other death, the other in his *Defence of Orthodoxy*, published next year, wherein he calls all good men to witness, and challenges bad men to contradict him if they can, that from the hour of the condemnation of Servetus, he had never said a word about the nature of the punishment,—I think it undeserving of further notice. I must only touch upon your solitary proof of the generosity and forgiveness of Calvin's disposition. After having been banished from Geneva on account of his rigour, he was recalled at the end of two years, in consequence of a turn in political affairs which induced the inhabitants, *unanimously* to vote his return. He came back accordingly : and you think it a proof of his "forgiving temper," (forgiving temper in John Calvin !) that he "did not, *at that moment*, secure the expulsion of his enemies." (*Def.* p. 27.) Sir, those whom you call his enemies, were among the leading men in procuring his recal. Ami Perrin, whom you call "the most implacable of his enemies," was the very man who was deputed to bear the decree of revocation to Strasburg, where Calvin was then resident. What proof of forgiveness is it, that he did not at once banish from Geneva, Perrin and the others who had just brought him back in triumph ? But although he did not "*at that moment*" expel them from the city, he kept his eye upon them, and in process of time was able to bring against the principal men among them, including Perrin, such charges of interference or attempted interference with his ecclesiastical system, that some of them were beheaded, some banished, others subjected to degrading punishments which deprived them of all publick respect : insomuch that it was a common remark that the patriots of Geneva had expelled the Priests, and the Presbyterian Ministers whom they brought in to supply their place, expelled the patriots. Galiffe, a Genevese Protestant, thus apostrophises Calvin,—"Thou wilt banish the founders of the independence of Geneva, who had given their blood and their wealth for liberty ! Thou wilt rail at them from the pulpit as scoundrels, ruffians, dogs ! Thou wilt burn, behead, drown, and hang those who will attempt to resist thy tyranny !" (*Lettre à un Protestant.*) This is expressed in terms too rhetorical for my taste ; but the main facts are true : they are stated in detail in every impartial history ; and cannot even be altogether suppressed by such writers as Beza, Drelincourt, and Paul Henry. I have taken some pains to gain an insight into the inner life of Calvin, as depicted in his own works and correspondence, and I have yet to learn a single instance in which any

man who crossed his path, whether in civil or ecclesiastical policy, was forgiven or forgotten: while the cases of Gruet, Bolsec, Servetus, the Bertheliers, Gribaldi, Perrin, Madame Copa, Gentili, and others abundantly prove that when his wrath was raised by opposition, nothing would satisfy him but the utter ruin of his antagonists, or their death if it was in his power to accomplish it. The sentences which he procured to be passed upon all in the foregoing list, involved the penalty of death. Most of them were condemned as *heretics:* but their real crime was that they resisted Calvin. Many of them, Servetus included, he tolerated while in the height of their heresy, and even honoured with his friendship; but as soon as they began to shew disrespect for himself, his fury knew no bounds. He could overlook their opposition to what he regarded as the truth of God, but not their contempt of his minister. I am not in this tract giving a full account of the character of Calvin. To his learning, his talents, his chaste, frugal, and temperate life, his great exertions for what he regarded as orthodox doctrine, I have done ample justice in the *Lectures* which have drawn upon me your censure. I wish to be understood as here repeating the eulogium there pronounced; not a syllable do I retract. But I cannot allow your disingenuous attempt to invest his memory with virtues which he did not possess, and to deny the existence of vices, which he and his friend Beza distinctly admit, which, indeed, were notorious to all his contemporaries, and are well known to all readers of history, to pass uncontradicted.

8. And this brings me to the last point of the history on which I propose to touch, the estimate you wish your readers to form of *the moral character of Michael Servetus.* Disguise it as you may from your readers and yourself, it is evident to me that you look upon the burning of him as a bad business: I am sure in your heart you detest it, and the share that Calvin had in it, first and last. I am sure you would cheerfully contribute a round sum, if it were possible, for a price paid, to blot out every record of the foul deed; I am certain you wish most cordially, either that Servetus had been let alone in the obscurity which he had courted, as a physician in a country town, occupying himself with publishing anonymous books containing strange and unheard of theories about religion, to which no considerable body of persons in the Roman Catholic Church or among the Reformed Communities seemed disposed to pay much heed;—or, that he had been prosecuted to the death for his heresy by some one else than Calvin. Deeply and earnestly, I am sure, do you deplore the necessity under which you lie of publishing a "defence" of a man whose conduct in the "case" under consideration, that of Michael Servetus, your own heart abhors. But the conduct of John Calvin, the great hero of orthodox presbyterian theology, having been impugned, you think the honour of your orthodox theology itself is in question; (*which however it is not, unless you and others like you make it so:*) and you are, as your writings have shewn, a thick and thin adherent of orthodoxy; and so you think that a "*Defence of Calvin*" of some sort or other, must

be got up: necessity, hard inexorable necessity, rules your fate; *you must defend Calvin:* and as his actions cannot be denied, and his motives are plain and patent in the sight of all men who know and consider his behaviour in this most atrocious instance,—there seems nothing else left for you to do, but *to blacken the character of the hapless victim.* Your management of Calvin's defence puts me in mind of a brief sent up to a Counsel in one of our courts of law, which contained nothing but the pithy direction,—"*Abuse the Plaintiff's Attorney!*" What you want in the "*Defence of John Calvin,*" you make up abundantly in the abuse of Michael Servetus, "*the Unitarian Martyr.*"

But allow me to ask you, Dr. Killen, does all the obloquy you can heap on Servetus, relieve Calvin of one particle of his own guilt and shame? The crime and the disgrace of Calvin consist in having *long, perseveringly,* and *unscrupulously* sought the blood of Servetus, *not on the ground of his licentious life,—his weak or culpable concealment of his opinions, or his timidity in the awful presence of the heaped pile ready to reduce his body to ashes; nor for any other weak, sinful, or unworthy conduct;* but avowedly on the ground of his being *a heretic and a blasphemer;* that is to say, *on the ground of differing from Calvin's judgment* on points which the latter held to be fundamental to his system of doctrine. "It is Calvin who is on his trial now; and it is no palliation of his direful and undeniable guilt to say that in some respects Servetus was not free from blame. It is *a poor defence of Calvin* to urge this plea,—it virtually admits that his conduct is incapable of a just defence; and I shall always regard the persons who put forward this apology, as speaking on my side of the question, and proving my words true, that Calvin's behaviour is without excuse." (*Lectures,* p. 56.)

But I go farther. I assert that if Servetus had been a man whose crimes and offences and polluted life warranted the strongest language that you have applied to him,—this circumstance, instead of *whitewashing* the character of Calvin, *actually dies it of a deeper black.* For the fact is notorious that Calvin *never once* expressed the slightest idea of taking away the life of Servetus, or subjecting him to any annoyance, on account of his immoral or dissolute life! In all Calvin's writings about Servetus, it is the *heresy,* not the *immorality,* that is made the plea for putting him to death. Servetus might have been leading the most notoriously dissolute life;—he might have been engaged in the gallantries which stained the life of Theodore Beza before he came to Geneva, he might have been perpetrating the unutterable abominations which Beza truly or falsely (I hope and believe, *falsely*) ascribes to himself in his poems;—he might have been, like him, polluting and corrupting the minds of the youth of Europe by publications "equally elegant and licentious;" and *had he only been orthodox,* not a finger would Calvin have stirred against him! Nay, had he come *to* Geneva, bowing and cringing to the "Great Reformer,"—ready to defend his *ipse dixit,* prepared to take up his controversies when they began to grow stale, to defend all his ferocious

persecutions, and to blacken the characters of all who assailed his intolerance or his theology,—he would, beyond all reasonable doubt, have met with the *same friendly reception that was accorded to Beza;* even though, like Beza himself, he had come reeking from the abodes of profligacy, and bringing with him the companion of his sin and shame. He had not so spent his youth; he had issued no licentious publications; he had devoted much time to the elucidation of the scriptures, and efforts for the farther reformation of religion; but he refused to bow to the Dictator of Geneva; and therefore he was execrated in works addressed to all Europe, denounced to the Inquisition, apprehended in a city where he was an inoffensive way-farer; and after a series of the most iniquitous proceedings that ever disgraced the name of public justice, was burnt to death by a slow fire. Make Servetus then as bad as your genius enables you to depict; you only make your Calvin the worse: for he could and would have overlooked his badness, but not his piety, integrity, and truth.

Servetus, however, was not so bad as you represent him. Sir, the first fact alleged in justification of the libellous epithets which you have connected with his name, is a gross calumny, borrowed from the *Bibliotheca Sacra.* You say that Servetus when taken to task for his first publication, "*professed to retract his errors,* and denounced it as a childish and imperfect publication: but in a little work entitled '*Dialogues concerning the Trinity,*' in the preface to which *he made this retractation,* he proceeded straightway, *with the utmost effrontery,* to reiterate his errors!" (*Def.* p. 7.) This, Sir, is a pure fiction, but your assertion of it I only impute to ignorance. Sir, I have that preface and the work which contains it, now lying before me: *I here translate it, in full.*

"CANDID READER,—I now retract all that I lately wrote in seven books against the received opinion respecting the Trinity, *not because it is false, but because it is imperfect, and as it were written by a child for children.* Yet, I beg you to retain as much of that work as will help you to understand what I am now about to say. That my former book came forth so barbarous, confused and incorrect, is to be ascribed to my want of experience and the printer's carelessness; and I trust no Christian will be offended on that account, since God often utters his own wisdom through the foolish organs of this world. Attend, I pray, to the subject matter; for if you apply your mind, my stammering words will cause no hinderance.—Farewell."

There, Sir, is the whole. *What do you think now of the blind guides who have persuaded you that Servetus, in this preface,* "*professed to retract his errors?*" Does he not expressly re-affirm the doctrines of his first work? Does he not confine his retractation solely to the incorrect execution of the book? I trust you will be ashamed of having circulated this calumny: for I will not impute to you the "*effrontery*" which you ascribe to Servetus. Your next fact is equally unfounded. You say that "he impudently challenged Calvin, at Paris, to a discussion on the Trinity," reckoning, as you think, on "the young Reformer's declinature, "who would have incurred the utmost danger, by taking up the gauntlet in a Roman Catholic kingdom." *Def.* p. 8.) But, Sir, you forget that "your young Reformer" was, at this time,

a beneficed dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church! And you forget to tell us what danger a Roman Catholic clergyman could have incurred, by defending the Roman Catholic faith, in a Roman Catholic kingdom, against a heretical assailant! And you forget the danger which the assailant himself would have incurred by attacking it! And you forget that neither Calvin nor Beza, nor any authority acquainted with the fact, has ever imputed to Servetus the giving of such a challenge; while, on the contrary, Calvin *claims credit for having volunteered his services* on that occasion! I hope, Sir, you will have more and better grounds when next you make a charge of "*impudence*" against any man. Again; you say that Servetus, "out of a quarrelsome and vainglorious disposition, publicly insulted the whole literati of the University of Paris, denouncing them as pests to the world; and in the end, was prohibited from lecturing." (*Def.* p. 9.) But your great authority, Paul Henry, gives a very different account of this affair. He tells us that "the University and the Faculty rose against him; *this was the result partly of envy;* and partly because he had accused many learned men of ignorance, especially in astronomy. *They attacked him in their lectures.* He *defended himself* by an answer in which he called them, among other things, the plague of the world. The dispute at last reached such a height, *that to get rid of him, his enemies employed, as a pretence*, his love of astrology; and he was forbidden to continue his astronomical lectures." (Vol. ii., p. 165.) This, Sir, is the truth. Contrary to your statement, Servetus was the defendant, not the assailant; and as to the University which took part against him, if Servetus had treated it as a body which had at heart the growth of sound learning, he would have been what you have called him, an "*abominable hypocrite.*" Again; you charge Servetus repeatedly with such a haughty and arrogant temper, as would have rendered it impossible for any one to bear with him even for a single day. Yet, it is notorious that the Most Rev. Father Palmier, who had been his pupil in the University, on being appointed Archbishop of Vienne, invited Dr. Villenueve (or Servetus) to take up his residence in his Palace, where he remained for several years; nor is any quarrel between them mentioned till the day when in consequence of the machinations of the "Great Reformer," he was arrested. Sir, you know that Calvin never remained under any man's roof for half the time: and that the only person whom he seems to have invited with any urgency to become his own guest, (I allude to M. de Bourgogne, the Sieur de Falais,) left his house abruptly, in consequence of his morose and inflexible intolerance. The real defects of Servetus I have very broadly stated in my *Lectures*, (p. 55.) But this shall not prevent me from vindicating his memory from the unjust reproaches which you have hurled against it. With all his defects, he was infinitely a better man than Calvin: for he never murdered nor sought to murder any one. But I decline to defend him by mere comparison. I demand an answer to the single question,—*How does the moral criminality of Servetus, for which he was*

never called to account, excuse the guilt of Calvin in putting him to a cruel death for his religious belief? This point you have not even attempted to discuss.

Sir, in commencing this answer to your pamphlet, I said it would not be needful to be prolix; yet I fear I have become so. I should like greatly to address you on some other points: such as the question whether Servetus ever defended the practice of intolerance, (as you affirm he did;) whether persecution is not authorised by the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechism; whether the Calvinists have really been the most consistent defenders of Religious Liberty; how far you, yourself, understand the principles of religious liberty, and are prepared to maintain them. I gather from your pamphlet, that you do not go the whole length of Calvin's intolerance, (*for which he would have burnt you!*) but where your halting place is, you do not explicitly state. On these points I may address you again should an opportunity occur. Meanwhile, let me invite you to consider whether the advice given in by Calvin to the protector Somerset, was not the immediate cause of the burning of Joanna Bocher, and the other Anti-trinitarians executed in England, in the reign of King Edward VI.; and did not thus *indirectly* afford the plea of excuse and palliation for the Marian persecution?

Reverend Sir, if I have spoken somewhat harshly to you in this Epistle, I need hardly assure you it is not from any personal contempt. You were my fellow-student in days of yore; and I remember with pleasure the evidence you then gave of ability and application, whence I and others, augured the distinction to which you would rise; nor has any one seen with greater satisfaction the fulfilment of this early promise. But, Sir, you have undertaken to do what is impossible: namely to make a "*Defence of John Calvin in the case of Michael Servetus*," and you have failed, as all have done who have attempted the same task before you. Your failure is the most conspicuous, only because it is the last. Though you write under a strong theological bias, you are not more disingenuous, but far less so, than several of your predecessors. In fact you shew much less of that failing than was to be expected in a Defender of Calvin: for which reason I subscribe myself,

Respectfully yours,
J. SCOTT PORTER.

REV. DR. KILLEN,
Professor of Church History in the Assembly's College, &c. &c. &c.

APPENDIX.

In Prælectionibus meis de *Serveto atque Calvino*, BEZAM dixeram "versibus elegantibus quidem illis sed libidinosis pariter, παιδερασ τίας laudes celebrasse; seipsum hujuscemodi lubidini indulsisse professum fuisse; atque juvenis cujusdam lepores, quocum nefandum stuprum admisisset cecinisse." BEZAM istud facinus reapse patravisse, ego nunquam affirmavi, neque nunc affirmo. Quum vero mihi probro apponat Doctissimus KILLENUS me rem talem lectoribus ob oculos posuisse, efficit ut de BEZÆ moribus pauca, eaque, varias ob causas, Latinè, hic apponenda censeam.

THEODORUS BEZA juvenis adhuc, Poematum Juvenilium quæ postea juris publici fecit, pleraque conscripserat. In his quædam esse "paullo licentiosius, ad CATULLI et NASONIS imitationem, scripta," ipse testatur: (v *Tractationes Theologicas*, p. iii. ed. 1576, fol.) unde tamen minime veretur, "ne qui se tum noverint qualis fuerit mores suos æstiment." "Quod ad istos Epigrammatum libellos attinet, quis tandem" rogat, "vel prius quam ego infelix eorum auctor damnavit, vel magis etiam hodie detestatur?" In *Præfatione* editioni alteri horum poematum præpositâ, se in scribendis epigrammatibus suis, CATULLUM atque MARTIALEM ante oculos habuisse, eos pro normâ usurpasse atque imitatum fuisse, confitetur. "Etsi enim, quod vere dico, illorum obscenitate sic offendebar ut oculos etiam ipsos a quibusdam inter legendum averterem, tamen, ut ætate illâ non satis cautus, ita illius quidem melle, istius vero salibus capiebar, ut in scribendo quam simillimus eorum, (de ipso charactere loquor,) evadere studerem." Libellus iste anno ætatis demum vigesimo nono, editus est. Ab urbe Aureliensi Parisios concessit; ubi, teste ipso, in illicebras haud paucas a Satanâ animæ suæ prætensas lapsus est. At in morbum gravissimum delapsus, ita ut aliquando de vitâ desperaret, judicium Dei justum veritus, secum votum concepit, si modo convaluisset, se cultum Dei purum atque verum aperte amplexurum, atque vitam reliquam Deo consecraturum. Quod et effecit. Nam a morbo experrectus, beneficia ecclesiastica pretio impenso vendidit, Genevam cum concubinâ perrexit eamque ibi publice in matrimonium duxit; atque, anno insequenti CALVINI gratiâ, Literarum Græcarum Professor in Academiâ Lausanensi electus, opera illa theologica atque polemica edere cæpit, unde tantum laudis nomini suo accessit. Anno 1569 poemata juvenilia iterum prelo commisit, illis exceptis quæ ipse utpote "licentiosius scripta" damnaverat: inter quæ erat Epigramma istud, *De suâ in Candidam atque Audebertum Benevolentiâ*, ad quod allusionem feci in *Prælectionibus* meis. Cum vero sint qui "nihil ibi cernere possint quod non sit BEZÆ prorsus honorificum," poema integrum, hic subjicere visum est.

THEODORUS BEZA DE SUÂ IN CANDIDAM ET AUDEBERTUM BENEVOLENTIA.

Abest CANDIDA: BEZA quid moraris?
AUDEBERTUS abest: Quid hic moraris?
Tenent Parisii tuos amores,
Habent Aurelii tuos lepores:
Et tu Vezeliis manere pergis,
Procul CANDIDULAQUE amoribus que,
Et leporibus AUDEBERTULOQUE.

Immo Vezelii procul valete;
Et vale pater, et valete fratres!
Namque Vezeliis carere possum,
Et carere parente, et his, et illis,
At non CANDIDULA AUDEBERTULOQUE!

Sed utrum rogo, præferam duorum?
Utrum invisere me decet priorem?
An quenquam tibi, CANDIDA, anteponam?
An quenquam anteferam tibi AUDEBERTE?
Quid si me in geminas ipse partes
Harum ut altera CANDIDAM revisat,
Currat altera versus AUDEBERTUM?

At est CANDIDA sic avara, novi,
Ut totum cupiat tenere BEZAM;
Sic BEZÆ est cupidus sui AUDEBERTUS
BEZA ut gestiat integro potiri.
Amplector quoque sic et hunc et illam
Ut totus cupiam videre utrumque,
Integrisque frui integer duobus.

Præferre attamen alterum necesse est:
O duram nimium necessitatem!

Sed postquam tamen alterum necesse est,
Priores tibi defero, AUDEBERTE!
Quod si CANDIDA forte conqueratur,
Quid tum? basiolo tacebit uno.

Videbit hic lector eruditus multa quæ suspicionem gravem prodant monstri aliquid verbis subesse, immo quæ luce clarius ostendant me hujusce poematis sensum recte esse interpretatum. Oden ipsam quicunque oculis non prorsus hebetibus lustraverit, ac simul poetæ excusationem de CATULLI, NASONIS atque MARTIALIS imitatione recordatus sit, vix inficias ibit quin ibi BEZA de amore illicito in puerum AUDEBERTUM loquatur. Si hos versiculos inter CATULLI vel MARTIALIS epigrammata invenissemus, quis unquam de sensu dubitavisset? At *sensum Catullianum eundemque Martialicum* his versibus competere, auctor est BEZA ipse, loco jam citato. Adde quod poeta CANDIDAM suam atque AUDEBERTUM aperte in eâdem ponat trutinâ: benevolentiam suam in ambos parem esse, atque plane ejusdem generis diserte testetur; nominibus diminutivis, blanditiarum indicibus de utroque utatur; neque ullum ponat discrimen ex quo illam quidem esse meretricem, hunc autem juvenem probum, immo virum gravem atque egregium, cerni possit. Vivo adhuc BEZÆ multi crimen *παιδεραστίας*, hoc freti epigrammate, conati sunt impingere: e quibus SANCTIUS virum honoratissum, GERMANUM nempe AUDEBERTUM jurisconsultum eximium, participem criminis nominavit. BEZA contra

hanc accusationem seipsum argumentis validissimis defendit. Nam, ut ipsius verbis utar, quid magis præposterum quam ut quis "suam cum honestissimo viro, et jam tum in Senatu Parisiensi Advocato quem dicunt, nunc vero in civitate Aureliensi magnâ cum dignitate versanti, amicitiam et familiaritatem summam, ad nefandum et execrandum illud scelus transferat, quod ne nominari quidem sine horrore potest?" Stuprum certe BEZAM cum GERMANO illo AUDEBERTO unquam commisisse nullo modo est suspicandum: sed hunc GERMANUM jurisconsultum eundem fuisse AUDEBERTUM qui in Epigrammate celebratur, locorum collatio redarguit: nam GERMANUS ille, teste BEZA, *apud Parisienses* Advocati munera exercebat; AUDEBERTUS autem, seu AUDEBERTULUS in poemate decantatus, *Aureliis*, ut ipsum evincit poema, degebat. BEZA proculdubio inimicos suos ac cavillatores personarum errore se ipsos decepisse, probe cognovit; at nihil sua referre putavit errorem corrigere unde ipsi tam liquida flueret contra eos defensio. Ad summam libenter sententiam meam profero, BEZAM *flagitium istud nefandum nunquam neque cum* GERMANO AUDEBERTO *nec quovis alio reapse perpetravisse.* Quum autem versiculi supra laudati extra dubium ponant eum de hac re poetice egisse, non dubitandum est quin pravæ atque corruptæ mentis nimium indulserit phantasiis; atque editis istis quorum postea ipsum pœnitebat Epigrammatibus, lectorum suorum ingeniis corrumpendis operam dederit. Quod ad CALVINI indolem pertinet, vix excusandus videtur, BEZÂ, tam malæ famæ viro, statim in amicitiam recepto, atque senatui Bernensi commendato ut qui juventuti ingenuæ instituendæ præcipue esset idoneus; nedum pro collegâ sibi assumpto in opere tam gravi qualis fuit supplicii a Serveto dati excusatio. Hominem quamvis doctum, acrique ingenio pollentem, qui annos tredecim conscientiæ suæ vim imposuisset, qui lucri parum honesti gratiâ suam de Dei Opt. Max. cultu, deque rebus sacris opinionem tot annos celavisset, qui nuper Genevam devenisset feminâ comitatus quâcum quatuor fere annos, nuptiis omissis, habitavisset,—hominem dico ejusmodi ad ejusmodi munera designare,—vix viri fuisse religiosi videtur. Quid hodie censeremus de Concilio quovis Academico, a quo ad gradum Professoris electus sit homo, qui candidatus accesserit, lævâ manu tenens concubinam veterem recens uxorem factam, dextrâ Epigrammatum licentiosorum libellum porrigens a se *intra anni spatium* editum? Peccatori resipiscenti veniam esse dandam libenter concedo: at resipiscentiæ testimonia multo firmiora cernere velim, quam rabiem illam effrænam quâ inimicos omnes CALVINI atque suos, viros se imulto inculpatiores, impugnavit THEODORUS BEZA; atque inter eos MICHAELEM SERVETUM, jam morte horrendâ ob Dei veritatem qualem ipse mente concipiebat, jubente et flagitante CALVINO interfectum.

ALEX. MAYNE, PRINTER, BELFAST.

WHAT IS PROTESTANTISM?

A DISCOURSE

PREACHED ON SUNDAY, DECEMBER 26, 1858,

IN

THE SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

BELFAST.

BY THE REV. JOHN PORTER.

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE CONGREGATION.

BELFAST:
HENRY GREER, 31, HIGH STREET.
1859.

TO MY FELLOW-CITIZENS OF EVERY PROTESTANT DENOMINATION,

WITH GRATEFUL REMEMBRANCE OF MORE THAN A QUARTER OF A CENTURY'S FRIENDLY INTERCOURSE,

AND WITH ANXIOUS DESIRE THAT THOSE RELATIONS WHICH I HAVE MYSELF FOUND SO AGREEABLE MAY BECOME UNIVERSAL AMONG PROTESTANTS OF EVERY NAME,

I Dedicate the following Discourse,

INTENDED TO UPHOLD THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION.

JOHN PORTER.

Windsor, Belfast,
8th April, 1859.

A DISCOURSE.

"Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven? Canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?"—JOB xxxviii. 33.

THE Protestant Reformation, in the sixteenth century, was as unexpected in its coming, as rapid and astonishing in its progress. Like the little cloud in the sky, not bigger than a man's hand, gathering unnoticed its elements of destruction on a warm summer's day, and, in a moment, sending forth the lightning and thunder—thus suddenly and unexpectedly did the Protestant Reformation burst upon the world. There were no premonitory symptoms of its approach. Leo X., the then Bishop of Rome, was enjoying his undisputed sovereignty over kings and nations, and indulging those elegant tastes for which he was remarkable. Nothing was farther from his apprehension, than a sudden and great attack upon his prerogative. The great heresiarchs and enemies of the Church had been exterminated, or silenced as they successively rose up. The Vaudois were murdered long ago in their mountain vallies; the Albigenses were crushed; Huss and Jerome had paid the penalty of their heresy at the burning pile; and Wycliffe's ashes were scattered to the winds. There was a perfect calm! Leo, at ease, enjoyed his favourite pleasures. There existed no longer, apparently, *a heresy* to condemn, or *a heretic* to burn. And yet, as some-

times happens in ordinary affairs, we are never less secure than when we believe ourselves most safe; so was it with the Papacy. And, just as it happened at the introduction of Christianity itself into the world: so did it fall out with respect to Protestantism. It pleased God to choose "the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are."

In the town of Wittemburg, in Upper Saxony, there exists, or did exist, a Church designated by the name "All Saints:" and here, at its porch, on the 31st day of October, 1517, at mid-day, a man, clad in the vesture of an Augustine monk, might have been seen, affixing certain papers on its outer pillars. What is there in that act to claim especial notice? Apparently nothing; for such things are of ordinary occurrence. Yet this is an act that will speedily make the world ring! For it is a bold challenge to Rome, to prove her title to the "Keys of Peter," and justify her claim to "retain and remit" human sin. And what is there deserving attention in the individual thus occupied? Apparently nothing. He is a man emaciated by study and habits of close confinement, and "so thin, that one might count all the bones in his body."* Yet this careworn, studious man, is the bearer of an imperishable name: for it is Luther, the man of destiny, who enters here upon the stage.

Let us endeavour, for an instant, to obliterate from our minds such knowledge as we have of subsequent events, and consider the nature of the act this man is here performing. All peaceful as the scene is, we trace to, and associate with it, our own religious liberty—a Bible unfettered, and our pre-

* Michelet.

rogative as Protestants asserted, to read, study, and judge of its contents. And, considering the boundless power at this period exercised by the Roman Pontiff, and the position of the poor monk, who here questions his infallibility, through these papers he is affixing on the Church pillars, I think even the enemies of Luther will admit, that the courage he displays can only be accounted for by ascribing it to a constraining sense of religious obligation. To every impartial student of history, this scene must always present itself in an interesting light, when, to quote the language of Michelet, "the chain of old tradition was broken, its continuity destroyed, and the seamless robe torn, of Papal authority." But other matters claim our attention. The effects of this daring act were immediate and striking. The publication of the papers, thus affixed to the pillars of "All Saints Church," struck like a thunderbolt on all Germany. Unconscious as Luther himself was of the fact, it appears he was, after all, only the *type* of the universal German mind. People of every rank declared in favour of his manifesto. Sovereigns, who had long groaned under Papal authority—patriots, who desired their country's welfare—good men, scandalized, like himself, at the corruption of the Church—wise men, aspiring after truth and mental freedom—all heartily united in the cause; and, ere the voice which first called the masses into action was hushed in the silence of the tomb, the arm of Papal power was broken, and the Reformation triumphant.

Who, bearing the Protestant name, cherishing the Protestant spirit, and acquainted with Church history, can think of that great conflict of opinion, and of the glorious man who led the people forth from out their bondage, without thrilling emotions of joy and gratitude?—joy for the victory then gained,

and gratitude to the Being, to whose mysterious providence it must be ascribed? Blessed be God, who raised up such a light to illuminate the darkness; and who gave to the weak, a victory over the mighty! Very often do I recall those events, and the names of the actors; and am filled with wonder, whenever I do, at the rapidity and magnitude of the Reformation.

But here a serious consideration forces itself upon us. If, in the space of half-a-century, this great work of the Reformation was accomplished; how is it, that during the subsequent 250 years, nothing apparently has been done—no advance made—no victories gained over the power of Rome? "During these 250 years," observes Macaulay, "Protestantism has made no conquests worth speaking of. Nay, we believe, that as far as there has been a change, that change has been in favour of the Church of Rome!!" In art, science, literature, philosophy, progress is universal; but there is little, if any, in Protestantism. In Italy, and France, and Austria, it is languishing, or has but a name to live; and, even in Great Britain, with all the aids arising from the patronage of the State and a free press, the priests of Rome are daily making inroads into its ranks, and triumphing in the conversion of its most distinguished advocates.

Assuredly, this is a subject deserving our deepest consideration. To what cause is the pause, if not retrograde movement, in Protestantism to be ascribed? This question I will endeavour now to answer. But, before doing so, let me briefly state what the great principles were on which the Reformation rested, and which so commended and endeared it at the beginning to men's hearts.

I believe I shall be able, by and by, to show you that these great principles were not faithfully acted on by their

professed advocates; and, if I can do so, then we shall have the probable solution of this most important question.

The three great principles of Protestantism are—

1. The rejection of human authority in matters of religion.
2. The sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith and duty.
3. The right of private judgment in determining the meaning of Scripture.

These propositions, simple in their nature, comprehensive in their meaning, and easily apprehended, constitute its very soul and essence.

When, on the 31st of October, 1517, Luther affixed his memorable "Theses" on the pillars of All Saints Church, he called in question (but did not positively, in that act, deny), the supreme jurisdiction of Rome: when, however, three years afterwards, on the 10th day of December, 1520, he cast into the flames, at the east gate of Wittemburg, the Bull of Leo, with the Decretals and Canons, enforcing Papal jurisdiction, he absolutely separated himself from the authority of Rome for ever. For, as Mosheim remarks, "the man who commits to the flames the code that contains the laws of his sovereign, shews, thereby, that he has no longer any respect for his government, nor any design to submit to his authority." How truly Mosheim interprets the full import of this act, is shewn by the language of the Reformer himself, in his conference with the Archbishop of Treves, in 1521, at the Imperial Diet of Worms. "I would rather lose my head than abandon the Divine Word. In what concerns the Word of God and faith, every Christian is as good a judge for himself as the Pope can be for him; for each man must live and die according to that faith. The Word of God is the common heritage of the whole Christian Church, each member of which is competent to explain it." Luther was by no means

ignorant of the different interpretations that had been put on portions of the Divine Word, and the great difficulty which existed, and must always exist, in sometimes arriving at its right meaning; but he knew, too, that the power to settle controversies, and explain doubtful questions, was a false assumption of Rome; and, therefore, however absurd the opinions which men might adopt from the perusal of Scripture, he saw that it was, on the whole, safest and best to leave the conscience free; therefore he accepted the alternative, and opened widely the Word of God, to be read and judged of by all the world. "I put no faith (he exclaimed) in the authority of the Pope, or of Councils, which have often been mistaken, and which have often contradicted one another, recognizing as I do, *no other guide than the Bible and the Word of God.* Such is my profession of faith; and expect none other from me. I have done, God help me, Amen."* It was in this faith he conquered! It was before the majesty of this doctrine of a free Bible, and a free interpretation of it, that "Bel bowed down, and Nebo stooped," and the pretensions of Rome were trampled under foot.

These sentiments, my brethren, of Martin Luther, thus bravely spoken before Charles V. at Worms, and the delegates of Rome, and the great nobles and princes of Germany, constitute the Magna Charta of our religious liberty. And, when I think of the grandeur of that Court before which they were uttered, and all the circumstances of the scene, shall I be charged with impiety, if my imagination contrasts it with that other scene, represented in the desert, when Moses delivered God's law at Sinai to the assembled people of Israel?

And now, if asked who are Protestants—I would answer, they who obey the terms of this charter;—who, conscious of

* Worms, April, 1521.

their powers, and responsibilities, and requirements, maintain their prerogative of freely reading the Word of God, and judging of its meaning;—who, with a fearless step, follow in the track which that Word enlightens;—but who freely concede to others the rights they themselves exercise, and unhesitatingly admit the widest differences of opinion. They are Protestants, who, persuaded that God alone is Lord of the conscience, refer entirely to God matters of conscience; and, while they candidly assert their own religious views, never do so in a dogmatic and arbitrary spirit, but feel it rather their Christian duty to respect the feelings of their opponents, and, even if required, to be aiding with them in maintenance of their religious liberties.

To my eye, the Protestant body presents itself, as a great miscellaneous crowd, in which it would be as impossible to select two individuals perfectly agreed upon all points of opinion, as it would be to select two individuals perfectly assimilated in complexion, face, and figure; while, nevertheless, a general resemblance might be recognized—a sort of family likeness, both in person and mode of thought. Thus "the uniformity amidst variety," with which God has marked the face of nature, is discoverable among ourselves, and, in my opinion, presents no cause whatever for dissatisfaction or sorrow, but rather for admiration, contentment, and gratitude; for it exists under God's providence and appointment, and is, therefore, right, and must somehow or other conduce to his glory.

Well, then, my brethren, if I have truly represented a Protestant in the description here given: if he be one who, while rejecting *human authority* in matters of religion, maintains *that of Scripture alone*; and asserts his own individual right of interpreting for himself its meaning and its doctrines;

and, if it has been found that *uniformity of opinion* is altogether incompatible with these premises, the question arises, what is *the duty* of Protestants under such circumstances? With what feelings are we to regard opinions different from our own, or the parties entertaining them, or their zealous promulgators? Surely with respect, and courtesy, and kindness. How could we, for very shame, treat them differently? Are we infallible? Are we to judge God's servants? Are we to pronounce authoritatively upon disputed questions? And, after all, is this the amount of our Protestantism, that we have moved the representative of Peter out of the Chair, to place ourselves in his seat? I do trust, this is not the manner of spirit we are of.

Look, my brethren, at this Book which I now hold up before your eyes! It is a copy of the Holy Scriptures! It is King James's Version, "appointed to be read in Churches!" A Version not absolutely perfect (it may be), but on the whole sufficiently satisfactory to all parties—for we all read, quote, and reason from this Version. Now, the Calvinist entertains not a doubt that the doctrines of absolute Predestination, of Election, and Reprobation, are distinctly inculcated in this book; and he even taunts the Arminian for imagining that he can ever pass the broad deep gulf between himself and Paradise, on the imperfect scaffolding by which his system proposes to bridge it over. The Arminian, on the other hand, is equally strong in his opposition to the aforesaid system, and feels amazed that such views of God and his dealings, as are entertained by Calvinists, should ever have possessed any man's mind. As he reads the Bible, such views are not only undiscoverable anywhere in its pages, but positively contradicted.

Next comes the Unitarian, holding in his hand these

identical Scriptures, about whose meaning the Calvinist and Arminian are disputing, and he lifts up his eyes in astonishment at both: for although he sees in Arminianism much to admire, yet he holds both Arminianism and Calvinism to be systems opposed to Scripture upon the most important of all questions, *i.e.*, the Nature of God—the Fall of Man—the object of the mission of Jesus Christ, and the Efficacy of our Lord's death. Here, then, are three characters, representing in their own persons the principal divisions of the Protestant world, and see how decidedly and widely they differ about the doctrines of the Bible. Now, which of these three is the true expositor of the Divine Word? Brethren, I cannot answer that question. No more can you, nor anyone in the whole world. It is for God alone to know whether any of them is altogether in the right, and if so, which. But this I can tell, that in going to Scripture for guidance in forming their opinions, they have acted like true Protestants; and, so far as they have acted uprightly in the matter, *i.e.*, honestly sought to know the mind of God, they are all, notwithstanding their differences of opinion, equally good Protestants; for they have thus practically illustrated the doctrines of the Father of the Reformation, "the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture, and the Right of Private Judgment."

Brethren, I trust I have said enough to let you see what Protestantism is, and I hope you agree with me, that it is not a Creed or a list of Dogmas, or any conceivable Form of Faith; but rather a free Bible, and a free interpretation of it. And that he only who acts upon this principle,—be he Calvinist, or Arminian, or Unitarian,—no matter what,—that he only is entitled to the honoured name of Protestant.

I trust I have your concurrence in the preceding argument, and that you agree with me in believing, that Protestantism is not a Creed.

Let me now solicit your attention to another subject of consideration, viz.:—the great inconsistency observable between Luther's principles and practice, as regarded matters of religion, and its pernicious influence on the progress of the Reformation.

This, assuredly, is not a pleasing task. It never can be so, to reflect upon the memory of the departed, and draw "their frailties from their dread abode;" and, especially, with respect to the Father of the Reformation, to whom the world is so deeply indebted. But the fact is indelibly written on the page of history, and the truth must be told, that Luther did not carry out his theory; and that the other great men of his time, also, who seceded from Rome, were equally inconsistent. Luther, who, when his own life was in the balance, uttered these brave words before Charles V., at Worms:—"In what concerns the Word of God, and Faith, every Christian is as good a judge as the Pope can be for him: the Word of God is the common heritage of the whole Christian world, each member of which is competent to explain it!" That very man, so soon as he had the opportunity, violated the charter of religious liberty which his own hand had drawn up, and his own tongue proclaimed; refused to his brother Reformers the right of determining on the sense of Scripture; and even added to his inconsistency the worst sin of the Church he assailed,—that of persecution for the sake of conscience. It is, indeed, sad to have this on record of so great a man. Carolostad, his coadjutor, because differing from him about the Real Presence in the Eucharist, was, by his influence, exiled from Wittemburg, driven from place to place, and obliged to earn his bread by daily labour.

The same fate, and for the same cause, befel Muncer. "He began to preach," says Sleidan, "not only against the Roman Pontiff, but even against Luther himself." The

former act might have been accounted laudable, the latter was an inexpiable offence; so Luther procured his banishment from Mulhausen, where he had been settled. He even refused to admit the Swiss and the German cities and states, which had adopted the sentiments of Zuinglius and Bucer, into the great confederacy that had been formed for the defence of the Protestant Church; choosing rather to risk the total destruction of his Cause, than to avail himself of the assistance of those who did not concur with him in every particular article of belief.* What a sad commentary this on the "sufficiency of Scripture and the right of private judgment!" Nor were the other great Reformers slow in imitating and improving on the example thus set by Luther. Calvin compassed the burning of Servetus, for denying the doctrine of the Trinity. The learned Beza wrote two treatises, to prove that heretics ought to be punished by the magistrate; and to justify the sentence pronounced upon "that blasphemer, Servetus!" Melancthon, the mildest of them all, records his entire approval of that deed. And, I am sorry to say, even Faustus Socinus, though he may not have been guilty of being accessory to the imprisonment of Davides—a charge often preferred against him—nevertheless, has distinctly taught in his writings that a heretic ought to be treated like a maniac—commiserated, but chained and imprisoned. Strange, that heresy should have been imputed where free inquiry was allowed! Yet, so it was. Opinions deliberately formed by one man, on a perusal of the Word of God, were as unceremoniously denounced by another; and the Reformer, when invested with power, assumed, without a blush, the infallibility he had denied to the Pope; and with the same remorseless spirit as that Church, "drunk with the

* Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.

blood of the saints," subjected the reputed heretic to all the varieties of persecution,—the evil name,—confiscation of goods,—the dungeon,—the torture, and the flames! Ah! what multitudes of honest men, and true Christians, whose only crime was that they understood too well their Protestant principles, and read the Bible for themselves, have paid for the exercise of their liberty with their lives? It would require many volumes to tell their names, and recount their history.

There is, however, some consolation in the reflection, that while the authors of the Reformation were thus trampling under foot their own principles, on which alone their secession from Rome could be justified, there were a few, sufficiently clear-sighted to foresee the consequences of their inconsistency, and candid enough to mark it with reprobation. One of these, named "Dudithеus," a distinguished Hungarian, writing to Beza in 1570, thus gives expression to his indignant feelings, at the conduct of the Reformers:—*

"You contend that Scripture is a perfect Rule of Faith and Practice. But you are all divided about the sense of Scripture; and you have not settled who shall be judge. You say one thing, Stancarus another. You quote Scripture, he quotes Scripture. You reason, he reasons. You require me to believe you. I respect you: but why should I trust you rather than Stancarus? You say he is a heretic: but the Papists say you are both heretics. Shall I believe them? They quote Historians and Fathers: so do you. To whom do you all address yourselves? Where is the judge? You say, the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets: but you say, I am no prophet, and I say, you are not one. Who is to be judge? I love liberty as well as you. You

* Vide Appendix.

have broken off your yoke; allow me to break mine. Having freed yourselves from the tyranny of Popish Prelates, why do ye become Ecclesiastical tyrants yourselves, and treat others with barbarity and cruelty, for only doing what you set them an example to do? You contend that your lay hearers (the magistrates,) are to be blamed, for it is they who banish and burn for heresy. I know you make this excuse: but tell me, have not you instilled such principles into their ears? Have they done anything more than put in practice the doctrine that you taught them? Have you not told them how glorious it was to defend the faith? Have you not been the constant panegyrist of such princes as have depopulated whole districts for heresy? Do you not daily teach, that they who appeal from your Confessions to Scripture ought to be punished by the secular power? It is impossible for you to deny this. Does not all the world know that you are a set of Demagogues, or, to speak more mildly, a sort of Tribunes, and that the magistrates do nothing but exhibit in public what you teach in private. You try to justify the banishment of Ochinus, and the execution of others, and you seem to wish Poland would follow your example. God forbid! When you talk of your Augsburg Confession, and your Helvetic Creed, and your unanimity, and your fundamental truths, I keep thinking of the Sixth Commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill.'"

In another letter to John Wolfius, one of the divines of Zurich, Dudithius represents the inconsistency of the Calvinists in accusing the Catholics of cruelty, as the Reformed are worse than they. "Tell me, my learned friend, now that the Calvinists have burned Servetus, and beheaded Gentilis, and murdered many others, and banished Bernardus Ochinus, with his wife and children, from your city,

in the depth of a sharp winter: now that the Lutherans have expelled Lasco, with the congregation of foreigners that came out of England with him, in an extremely rigorous season of the year: having done a great many such exploits, all contrary to the genius of Christianity, how, I ask, shall we meet the Papists? With what face can we tax them with cruelty? How dare we say, our weapons are not carnal? How can we any longer urge, let both grow together till the harvest? Let us cease to boast that faith cannot be compelled, and conscience ought to be free."

And now, brethren, having seen what Protestantism was at the first, as enunciated by Luther, and explained on many occasions;—and having abundant evidence of the very different thing he made of it, subsequently;—and, having seen how the other great Reformers imitated, and even surpassed him in inconsistency; I think you can easily comprehend why it was that the great wave which arose on the Baltic shores, and rolled over all Germany, fell back when it smote upon the Alpine barrier; and why it has, ever since, had more of a retrograde than a forward motion. I do not think, taking into due consideration the example of the great Reformers, you can fail to perceive that Protestantism must quickly have declined in public estimation, and that people generally must have preferred the old system, with all its faults, to that which began to rot as soon as it acquired strength. Protestantism belied itself: was false to its professions: refused the liberty it proffered, and cancelled its own bond. It lifted the veil which covered the religious tyranny of a thousand years, and let the light enter upon the dark deeds of priests and pontiffs. It published to the world the people's rights and wrongs. Yea, it did more: it said, I will set you free: I will be a saviour unto you: I will break your

priestly chains: I will breathe into your souls the breath of freedom, and make you a holy nation unto God: yea, all that Jesus intended you should be. But what did this mighty promise end in? Why, the very men who were so loud in their professions had whips and fetters in reserve, to be used as the opportunity offered:—and when it offered, they played such strange fantastic tricks before high heaven, as may be extenuated on the ground of ignorance, vanity, selfishness, and a belief that they were aiming at good by questionable means, but which never can be justified.

Brethren, we may perhaps excuse these aberrations of the Fathers of the Reformation, but we must for ever deplore them. These men, by their dogmatism and intolerance, not only furnished Rome with a handle against Protestantism,—which she readily perceived, and successfully used,—but they did even worse, in bequeathing a legacy of strife to succeeding generations. As each Reformer felt himself strong and influential, he set up his own favourite system, and all the machinery requisite for giving it perpetuity. Catechisms were compiled; Confessions of Faith set forth; Subscription to Creeds enforced; Anathemas against Recalcitrants freely enunciated. Professedly, each individual was zealous for the Bible, because each individual felt sure and certain that the Bible was on his side; and so party feeling arose, and, once begun, is still continued, and waxes strong in proportion to our conviction of the soundness of our own theological system.

There is, I am sorry to say, no part of the British nation in which a sectarian spirit is more strongly displayed than here in Belfast. Our great and flourishing town is divided into, I know not how many hostile sects, each proud of, and triumphing in, its own distinctive Creed. This Creed is to

them as the Ark of the Covenant to Israel,—a thing not to be touched without peril. Around it defences of all kinds are thrown up, from behind which its partizans make their onslaughts on the foe, or repel agression. Here stand the sturdy followers of Calvin, defending the Westminster Confession, and its distinctive dogmas, with the same desperate energy that has carried their flag victorious over many a bloody field. There, again, are ranged in serried ranks the members of the Established Church, boasting of their beautiful Liturgy—pleased with the Constitution of their Church—and hardly admitting the validity of Presbyterian Ordination. Strong are both these Churches in numbers, in zeal, in antagonism, and, though mutually disclaiming every pretension to infallibility, yet without one shade of doubt as to the soundness of their own respective Creeds. Sometimes, indeed, there is a talk of an alliance between these Churches, named "Evangelical," but if it ever existed at all, it has not been accompanied by any marked results. Besides these, we have the numerous and zealous followers of Wesley, the Unitarians, Independents, Covenanters, Baptists, and others: each body holding the uncomfortable position of Ishmael, "his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him."

Such is the aspect of Protestantism in this town; and, I may say, over the world. It is "a house divided against itself:" a family, the members of which spend their time, not in soothing and assisting each other, but in exposing each other's infirmities, and punishing one another for imaginary faults.

Brethren, I can readily imagine some of you to make the following comment on the preceding remarks:—"Sir, that which you have brought under our consideration, is unfor-

tunately too true. Protestants have acted inconsistently, criminally, and though the tone of society is now considerably improved, there exists here among us far too much sectarian strife and bickering. But how can *you* hope to correct the evil? Do you imagine that *your influence* can operate on the great parties that are here opposed to one another?" I frankly confess that I entertain no such presumptuous imagination. But I trust I shall not offend by the expression of an opinion, that it is quite possible for all Protestants, of every party, to be united together as one man in strict and cordial alliance, without any sacrifice whatsoever, of their distinctive religious doctrines. And, surely, if this were possible, it were most desirable.

Well, then, how is such a union to be effected? Very simply, indeed—just by carrying honestly out, the two principles which all Protestants profess to hold, viz.:—the Sufficiency of Scripture, and the Right of Private Judgment. This need change no man's faith; lessen no man's zeal; and wound no man's conscience.

Let me offer, as illustrative of the propriety of this recommendation, an imaginary case; viz., of two individuals representing the two extreme phases of Protestantism—one a Trinitarian, the other a Unitarian. Both parties take their stand upon the Bible, and are alike confident. Both are agreed, however, that one of them must be in error. But which of the two? That is the question. There exists not on God's earth a man able to answer that question, and authoritatively decide the controversy. They may seek the assistance of the wise and learned; that is perfectly right. They may have recourse to works of criticism, this too is right; but an oracular response will for ever be denied them. There is no alternative left, therefore, but to fall back upon their own

judgment and conscience, and abide by the best opinion they can respectively form.

And might not all this be done in a spirit of perfect kindness, without one shadow of dissatisfaction crossing their paths? Oh! if men had always acted thus, respecting each other's honest opinions, instead of condemning them, how many crimes had been averted, and how much better had it been for the world!

Brethren, it is our duty to *allow* such differences: yea, we are called upon, as Protestants, to do much more; *to maintain the right* of every man to his opinions, without prejudice to his character, his person, or his property. It is no concern of mine that a fellow-citizen holds opinions designated Orthodox, or Heterodox, but it is my concern that he shall not suffer for his belief, and while the breath is in me, I will maintain his liberty as I would my own. From him, on the other hand, I demand a like return.

It will not do for either party to refuse such sympathy and support, on the plea of conscientious scruples. It is not an affair of conscience at all, but justice. It is not opinion, which is here involved, but the right of opinion. If entitled to such right, then we are bound stedfastly to maintain it.

Let no man say, Shall we maintain error—dangerous, fatal, damnable error? This is begging the question. How can you tell what doctrine, or system of doctrines, is false and damnable? Are you inspired? Are you a judge in such matters? Is there any judge? Not one.

How happy were it if we could all thus recognize each other's rights; thus respect each other's differences in religion. Then would Protestantism present itself to the world in all its glory, as the foe of superstition, the friend of free opinion, and the liberator of mankind; and its professors

be as a mighty host united together, not by uniformity of creed, but by the holier ties of toleration and brotherhood. They who would reduce it to a Creed, or Sect, violate its fundamental principles.

I am happy in being able to testify, that the small ecclesiastical Body with which I am myself connected, has always consistently maintained the two great principles, of the "Sufficiency of Scripture, and the Right of Private Judgment." The Presbytery of Antrim, since its formation about a century and a half ago, has been "a Non-Subscribing" Church, requiring from intrants into the ministry, no more definite confession of faith than the above; and, I am not aware that there was ever cause to regret this freedom. Our ministers and laity have differed, and do differ in opinion, but without offence, and without strife. Thus agreeing, as we do, to differ upon points of doctrine, it would be very inconsistent, indeed, and very unworthy in us, did we not regard the ministers and members of other communions with the most friendly feelings; and, I take upon me to say, we do thus regard them.

As a minister, I am pleased to think, that, not unfrequently have pastors of other churches, differing widely from myself in doctrine, preached in this pulpit. And it has always been to me a cause of especial satisfaction, that the great and good John Wesley once stood where I now stand, and preached to a Belfast audience. Assuredly, John Wesley honoured this place by his presence: but I feel I am entitled, while making this acknowledgment, to claim some praise for the congregation that invited him. The act shews that the people had not drunk in the poison of sectarianism. They were not afraid of their principles being confuted, even by John Wesley, but acted with that liberal and kindly spirit

which became consistent Protestants; and, I trust that their example will never be forgotten in this congregation.

Brethren, I have endeavoured to explain to you what Protestantism really is, and also to show you how (not from anything faulty in itself, but from the inconsistency, bigotry, and intolerance of its advocates,) it has not succeeded in realizing the expectations of its friends. The intolerance of its sects, and the intolerance of the leaders of its sects, was its ruin at the first, and continues still to be its ruin. Surely, brethren, if I am authorised, not merely to read my Bible, but also to judge of its meaning, then it is impossible for me to be a heretic; for more than this cannot be done, and better than this cannot be done. I am in this case fulfilling to the letter the Protestant Rule, and, therefore, my heresy is an impossibility.

It follows, from the same premises, that every true Protestant must be Orthodox: the Calvinist and Arminian, the Arian and Socinian, with all who read the Bible for themselves, are Orthodox, in the right sense of the word, each walking, according to his own perception of the divine light, towards the habitation of the Universal Father. Where there is no judge, one man is as Orthodox as another.

And now, my brethren, let me ask, is not the course of duty manifest, which this view of Protestantism indicates? Can it be aught but this? "Follow after charity" (1 Cor. xiv. 13). "Live in peace" (2 Cor. xiii. 11). "Let us not, therefore, judge one another any more" (Rom. xiv. 13). "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5).

I can truly declare, that I have myself endeavoured to act in accordance with these exhortations of the Apostle, in the immediate sphere of my own ministerial labours. I respect

and love my fellow-citizens of all churches, irrespective of their religious views; and, in my ordinary intercourse with them, have never allowed sectarian considerations to sway my conduct. To such a course I felt myself imperatively called, as a minister of this Church, as a Protestant, and as a Christian.

Let me not, on this account, be charged with indifferentism about religion. I am far from being indifferent upon this all-important subject, and from wishing others to be indifferent. On the contrary, I hold that every man should be frank in the avowal of his religious convictions, and zealous in their advocacy. But a zeal, neither according to knowledge, nor accompanied with charity, can never be promotive of good; and I feel bound, as a Christian, to treat dissentients in doctrine (as I hope to be treated by them), with forbearance, gentleness, and kindness. In fact, there is hardly any sacrifice I am not prepared to make, consistent with integrity, to assist in putting an end to those dissensions, misnamed religious, we have had so much of—to unite the discordant members of the Protestant Church—to heal her wounds—and hush the clamour of her Sects in eternal silence. Most fervent is my prayer to God for the coming of a time when men of every shade of opinion shall be united together, through a spirit of the most perfect toleration; and when it may be said of us, as it used to be of the early Christians, —"See how these [Protestants] love one another!" Amen. "Even so, come Lord Jesus."

APPENDIX.

A BRIEF notice of Dudithius, and the individuals mentioned in his remarkable letters to Beza and Wolfius, may be interesting to some of my readers :—

ANDREW DUDITHIUS, descended from noble parents, was born at Buda, in Hungary, in 1533. After a careful preliminary education, he completed his studies at the Universities of Padua, Venice, and Paris. Having attracted the favourable regard of Cardinal Pole, he accompanied him to England, and remained attached to his suite during his memorable visit to that country. On his return to Hungary, he was received with favour by the king, and invested with two honourable Ecclesiastical appointments. In 1562, he appeared as a representative of the Hungarian clergy at the Council of Trent, and was much distinguished there for his eloquence and ability, having spoken at great length on five different occasions. Soon after, he resigned his bishoprick, and separated himself entirely from the Romish Church, for which act he had the honour of being burned at Rome in effigy. He died at Breslau, in 1589.

STANCARUS, a native of Mantua, flourished at the same period as Dudithius. He filled for a time the chair of Hebrew at the University of Cracow : was an able controversalist, and held many disputations with Beza and Calvin, on questions of religion.

BERNARD OCHINUS, born at Sienna, in Italy, in 1487. He was a singularly gifted man, and so popular as a preacher, that princes and prelates were frequently of his audience. Charles V. having heard him preach, observed of him, " That man would make the

stones weep." Through John Valdez and Peter Martyr, he was induced to withdraw from the Church of Rome, and betake himself to Switzerland. Cranmer prevailed on him to visit England, and, so long as he enjoyed the power, extended to him his protection; but, on the death of Edward VI., Ochinus was compelled to quit the kingdom. Arriving at Geneva, the day after the execution of Servetus, he incurred the hostility of Calvin for the freedom with which he commented on that act. His subsequent life was a train of misfortunes. His religious views being unpopular in Switzerland, he was driven from city to city at the instigation of the ministers, until at last reaching Slacow, in Poland, he found a release by death from his persecutors, in 1565.

John a Lasco, a native of Poland. He was invited by Cranmer to England, at the same time as Ochinus; was settled in London, and placed as Superintendent over the Church of the German Refugees. Mary, on coming to the throne, drove both himself and congregation out of the kingdom. After his expulsion he took refuge in Germany, but his views regarding the Eucharist drew down upon him the same treatment from the Lutherans as he had previously experienced from the Roman Catholics. He fled to Poland as an asylum, and died at Pinczow, in 1560.

Gentilis, a native of Cosenza, in the kingdom of Naples: beheaded at Berne, in Switzerland, in 1566, "for having obstinately oppugned the mystery of the Trinity."

ALEX. MAYNE, PRINTER, HIGH STREET, BELFAST.

CHRIST'S DOMINION OVER THE SABBATH ASSERTED.

A DISCOURSE

ON

MARK ii. 27, 28.

BY J. SCOTT PORTER,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

BELFAST:
HENRY GREER, HIGH-STREET.
LONDON: E. T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.

1856.

TO ROBERT GRIMSHAW, ESQ., D.L., J.P.,

&c. &c.

Dear Sir,

I Dedicate to you this Discourse, the substance of which you heard preached as a Sermon, and expressed a wish to see in print. I have peculiar pleasure in prefixing to it your name, because since first I had the pleasure of your acquaintance, you have been, in public and in private life, a sincere and consistent advocate of Religious Liberty, and a firm friend to the intellectual and moral culture of the working classes, to whose social elevation and spiritual improvement, I have had especial regard in composing this Discourse.

Your Friend and Pastor,

J. SCOTT PORTER.

Belfast, 10*th June*, 1856.

DISCOURSE.

MARK, ii. 27, 28.

And he said unto them, the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: therefore the Son of Man is lord also of the sabbath.

THE context shows that our Lord is here speaking of the *Jewish* sabbath; and, had the context not shewn it, the fact would, nevertheless, have been certain, because, during his lifetime, no other sabbath was known. This Jewish Sabbath he recognizes as a divine institution, but he affirms that it was one of those things over which he had full authority. He was "lord of the sabbath." He had power to confirm it or to repeal it. He had power to render its observance more strict or less strict. He had power to alter the time of its observance, or to continue it as Moses had prescribed. He had power to extend the precept for its observance to new classes of persons, or to exempt from its provisions all or some of those on whom it had been binding from the first. I propose to consider in this discourse the manner in which our Saviour has exercised his dominion over the sabbath; more especially with reference to ourselves, as Gentile Christians. It will help to clear our view of this question if we begin with a glance at the Sabbath-law, as it stood in the code of Moses.

The Ten Commandments are given twice, once in Exodus (ch. xx.), and once in Deuteronomy (ch. v.), but the sabbath-precept is the same in both places: at least the variations are merely verbal. "Remember the sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the sabbath of Jehovah thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work; thou nor

thy son nor thy daughter, thy man-servant nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." The reason annexed to this commandment in the 20th chapter of Exodus is, that "in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day." In Deuteronomy the reason assigned is different; it declares the ordinance to have been given "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou: and remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence with a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." (Deut. v. 14, 15.) The same reason is assigned in the 23rd chapter of Exodus—"Six days shalt thou do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and that the son of thine handmaid, and the stranger may be refreshed." (Exod. xxiii. 12.) To this declaration our Saviour alludes when he affirms that "the sabbath was made for man;" but it was clearly the intention of the lawgiver to recommend the sabbath by *both* the reasons stated.

From this law, and the reasons, explanations, and enactments relating to it, which are given in various parts of the Five Books of Moses, the following points are evident:—

First, that the sabbatical precept enjoined *a total cessation from labour* on the sabbath day—a rest for master and servant—for man and beast. This was all that the precept enjoined; but in requiring thus much, it was very strict. Not even a fire was permitted to be kindled in any house on the sabbath; the needful labours of harvest were required to be suspended on that day;* and the person who profaned it by doing work, *even by gathering a few sticks* upon it, was to be put to death without mercy. †

* "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to Jehovah. . . . . Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day." (Exod. xxxv. 2, 3.) "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest; in earing time and in harvest shalt thou rest." (Exod. xxxiv. 21.)

† "Whosoever doeth work therein," (*i.e.*, *on the sabbath of rest,*) "shall be put to death." (Exod. xxxv. 2.) "Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore: for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from amongst his people. Six days may work be done, but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest, holy to Jehovah: whosoever doeth any work in the sabbath day he shall

Secondly, it is evident that this sacred repose was to be enjoyed *on the seventh day of the week*, according to the Jewish manner of computing time ;—that is to say, from sun-set on Friday till sun-set on Saturday.* This, and no other time, was set apart by the commandment, as the sabbath of Jehovah the God of Israel.

Thirdly, it is evident that the precept was addressed exclusively to the Jews.† They were the people whom God had "brought up out of the land of Egypt;" and who were commanded to keep the sabbath in memory of their deliverance from "the house of bondage." No other nation under heaven was called upon to observe, or ever did observe, this law. Hence, the sabbath was declared to be "a sign *between Jehovah and the children of Israel*, for ever:" (Exod. xxxi. 17:) which it could not be, if other nations had been enjoined to keep the sabbath.

These points are of importance, with a view to the discussion on which we are about to enter; and I apprehend their correctness must be evident to every one who reads the Decalogue with attention.

And from all this it is quite manifest that the Fourth Commandment, *as it stands in the law of Moses*, cannot bind us; because we are Gentiles. The precept was addressed to the

surely be put to death." (Exod. xxxi. 14, 15.) "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath-day; and they that found him gathering sticks, brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation; and they put him in ward because it was not declared what should be done to him. And Jehovah said unto Moses, 'The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp.' And all the congregation brought him without the camp and stoned him with stones, as Jehovah commanded Moses." (Num. xv. 32—36.)

* The Jews, in all religious concerns, consider the day as commencing and closing at the moment of sun-set, and such has been the computation of their forefathers from the most remote antiquity; grounded upon the very natural idea that darkness prevailed before light was created. We find this computation in the first chapter of Genesis—"The evening and the morning were the [*first, second,* &c.] day." (Gen. i. 5, 8, 13, &c.) Hence we read, "*From even unto even shall ye celebrate your sabbath.*" (Lev. xxiii. 32.)

† That the whole Decalogue was addressed to the Israelites, and to them alone, the preamble itself shews—"I am Jehovah thy God, *who brought thee out of the land of Egypt*, out of the house of bondage. . . . Six days shall THOU labour, &c." (See also the reasons assigned for the institution of the sabbath, in Deut. v. 13, already quoted.) Proselytes who got themselves circumcised, and were thus adopted as Israelites, were doubtless obliged to keep the sabbath, but they also made themselves "debtors to keep the whole law" of Moses.

Israelites exclusively. But we are not Israelites. The law, therefore, was not meant for us: and, of itself, it is not binding upon us.

Moreover, if it were binding upon us, it would bind us to observe the seventh day of the week; that is from sun-set on Friday, till sun-set on Saturday; which no one among us ever thinks of setting apart as holy time. Consequently, if we are bound by the Fourth Commandment, we are, all of us, notorious and flagrant transgressors of the law of God—those among us included, who are most strenuous in endeavouring to enforce "the strict observance of the Sabbath."

And lastly, if we are bound by the precept, we violate it most perseveringly and unscrupulously, in the manner in which we observe the day that is now regarded by many as "the Christian Sabbath." Some Christians, in their catechisms and creeds, lay down a rule for the observance of the Lord's Day, (the *first day* of the week,*) infinitely more galling than God ever prescribed for the sabbath under the Old Testament: yet in practice, I have never met with a single individual who thought it necessary to make even an outward show of practising that entire intermission of labour which the Fourth Commandment most solemnly enjoins.

For example: there are in this town, many persons, both ministers and laymen, who petition Parliament once a-year, to beg that a law may be passed for putting down what they call "Sabbath Desecration:" but I should like to know how many houses there are in Belfast (I speak of those in which there is meat to cook and fuel to cook it with), in which *no fire is lighted* on the day that these petitioners call "the Sabbath." I apprehend that *most* people who can afford it—both ministers and laity—have, on that day, a hot breakfast, a hot dinner, and another repast in the evening. Are all these prepared without a fire? *Credat Judæus!*

I remember that once a splendid sermon was preached in one of the most fashionable meeting-houses in Belfast, against the running

* It should always be remembered that what we call the first day of the week, (namely, from twelve o'clock on Saturday night till twelve o'clock on Sunday night,) does not exactly coincide with the first day of the week among the Jews, for that included the time between sun-set on Saturday and sun-set on Sunday. This last would be our sabbath, if "the first day of the week" were made a sabbath [illegible] instead of the seventh, and if no farther explanation of the time were subjoined.

of Railway Trains upon a Sunday. The minister declared that every sound of the steam-whistle on "the holy Sabbath was answered by a scream of joy from the fiends in hell!" * The sermon made a great noise; it was warmly applauded; it was considered to have amply sustained the preacher's reputation as one of the most eloquent of living men. A few Sundays afterwards, I was passing his place of worship, before the congregation was dismissed, and I counted twenty-four or twenty-five carriages and other vehicles—*all private vehicles*—waiting at the entrance, to convey their owners home from divine service. This congregation had sent forward, and I believe still sends forward, its petition "for the better observance of the sabbath." But the array of carriages still appears, in rank and file, before the vestibule on Sunday. So that although it is deemed a very good thing, and a highly meritorious act, to put down the running of the Railway Train—*the poor man's vehicle*—it is by no means wished nor intended by these petitioners, to interfere with the comforts of the rich or the luxuries of the great. Surely if these wealthy petitioners believed that the law of the sabbath is still in force, they would not permit their domestic servants to toil in attendance upon them from morning till night,—preparing and serving up their meals,—cleaning and settling up their apartments,—grooming, harnessing, and driving their horses,—coming at their call, and doing their bidding, scores of times, on that day which they consider as "the sabbath of rest unto Jehovah!" They would regard it as *a sin* to order out their equipages, to carry them anywhere on such a sacred day. To bring their horses and carriages to the place of religious worship—what is it—according to the sabbatarian view, but to parade before God's own face, as well as before the faces of their fellow-men, their violation of His express command—"In it thou shalt not *do any work*; thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter, *thy man-servant nor thy maid-servant*, nor thine ox nor thine ass, *nor any of thy cattle*, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; *that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou.*" (Deut. v. 14.)

* No person who has been for some years resident in Belfast can be unaware that I here allude to a sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. Morgan, in Fisherwick Place Presbyterian Church.

I hope none of you will suppose that I am condemning those who make use of a vehicle, *hired or private—for I see no difference in principle between them*—to convey them to their place of worship on the Lord's Day. You will perceive by and by, if you have not perceived it plainly enough already, that my notions are very different. I allude to this fact, or rather to the family of facts of which this is one, to show that people's *real opinions* on this point are not to be known from their church-creeds, nor from the catechisms which they teach their children, nor from the petitions to which they put their names. Many, whom, if we judged of them by these tests, we should regard as strenuous advocates for the sabbatical precept and its perpetual validity, are found, when we look to their *actions*, the only sure test, to believe in no such thing. They are, in short, very good people. They go to their church or meeting-house on Sunday. They hear a discourse on the eternal obligation of the Fourth Commandment. They admire the zeal of their pastor. They are captivated by his eloquence. They come forth in a very elevated frame of mind. They are offered a petition to sign for the prevention of "Sabbath Desecration," and they put their names to it in the vestry or the vestibule. At the church door they find their elegant equipages awaiting them. The steps are flung down by a liveried attendant: they get in: the door is clapped to behind them: another servant gives the signal to the impatient steeds; and off they dash, leaving creed and catechism, preacher and petition, very far behind them in a very short time. Yet, all the while, they are filled with gratitude for the sweet privilege they have enjoyed, in the opportunity of doing something to prevent "the desecration of the holy sabbath!"

These are good and worthy, but thoughtless people. There are some, however, who have thrown themselves into the existing agitation, whose whole policy shews that they have taken up the subject in the mere spirit of hypocrisy and cant. For example, a Bill was not long since brought into Parliament to promote the better observance of the sabbath. But it directed its penalties almost exclusively against *Sunday trading*,* a point upon which the com-

* The Bill here alluded to was that introduced into the House of Commons by Lord Robert Grosvenor, in the Session of 1855, which passed the second

mandment says not a word *expressly;* and it denounced no punishment against *sabbath labour by domestic servants,*—which the precept in the Decalogue expressly condemns. The reason for the distinction is plain. *Sabbath labour by domestic servants* is always a convenience to *the rich man* and his family. *Sunday trading* is sometimes a convenience *to the poor man* and his family; therefore the one was taken and the other left! Some years age I read a bill which was designed to interfere with Sunday labour as well as with Sunday trading. It was drawn with the utmost care, so as to give the magistrate no cognizance of labour in any *dwelling-house;* the only kind of labour by which the rich are directly benefited on that day. It would have prevented a baker from heating or drawing his oven between twelve o'clock on Saturday night, and twelve o'clock on the night following; the time when the workman or the small tradesman would wish to get a joint roasted for his Sunday's dinner. But this same Bill *permitted* the "setting of sponge" on a Sunday evening, after nightfall; because it was believed that otherwise *hot rolls and fresh breakfast bread* could not be got ready for the nobility and gentry on Monday morning. So different are the rules of sabbatarianism respecting the poor man's comforts and the rich man's luxuries!

Such sabbatarianism is downright hypocrisy; bare-faced, undisguised hypocrisy. But all sabbatarianism is not such; a great deal of it is very honest, but far mistaken. The facts, however, are sufficient to show that there is no part of the Christian world, sabbatarian or otherwise, which even pretends to act upon the principle so loudly proclaimed in words, that our Saviour as "lord of the Sabbath," has made the sabbath law perpetual in his church; that he has made it binding on all believers,—those of Gentile as well as those of Jewish descent; and has only transferred the observance from the seventh day of the week to the first. The practice of the whole Christian world is with me, when I maintain

reading on the 3rd of May in that year, and was withdrawn on the 2nd of July, in consequence of certain tumultuous assemblages which threatened to produce disagreeable results to persons of the upper ranks, frequenting the Parks on Sunday. Thus a concession was made to turbulence which had been refused to reason: a most dangerous precedent; but necessitated by the original folly of the measure and its patrons.

that *the Fourth Commandment, in common with all the other ceremonial precepts of the law of Moses, is repealed, so far at least as to be of no force in the case of Gentile Christians.* The practice even of that small but noisy part of the Christian world which modestly assumes to itself the title of "the religious public,"—intimating that all who lie outside its border are *not* religious, and that all who lie within it *are*,—is with me here. Their creeds and their declarations, I admit, are against me: but I do not trust their declarations nor their creeds, against *themselves.*

The liturgy of the Church of England is against me. She has inserted in her Communion Service, a prayer in the form of a response, to be uttered by the people after hearing the commandment which enjoins *a total cessation of all kinds of work* on "*the seventh day*, the sabbath of the Lord." The worshippers are therein made to exclaim, "Lord have mercy upon us, *and incline our hearts to keep this law!*" It is evident that the church regards the commandment as still binding upon the conscience; yet not one of her members ever thinks of observing it in its simple and natural sense!

The churches which use, as their standards of faith, the documents compiled by the Westminster Divines, are against me. Their ministers subscribe, and are bound to teach, in the words of the Shorter Catechism, that "from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly sabbath; and the first day of the week ever since, to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian sabbath." And farther, that "the sabbath is to be sanctified by a holy resting *all that day* even from such *worldly employments* and *recreations* as are lawful on other days; and spending *the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship*, except so much as is to be taken up in the *works of necessity and mercy*." Of this statement, I cannot but say, that while it declares the first day of the week to be "*the Christian sabbath*," (which is a phrase not once to be found in the Bible,) it makes its observance ten times more oppressive than ever was the sabbath of the Jews, even under the strictest interpretation of the law. In fact, this "Christian sabbath" of the modern sabbatarians, is a thing shocking to the mind

of every considerate man. It not only enjoins "a total resting all the day from worldly employments," which—if the term *employment* be meant to include occupations that are not of the nature of *work*, (and why else was this new word brought in?)—is more than the precept on Sinai required; but it prescribes an entire cessation even from "those *recreations* that are lawful on other days." *Now the commandment given on Sinai says not one word against innocent recreations on the sabbath-day.* In fact, the law of Moses distinctly sanctions recreation on the sabbath. "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and *was refreshed.*" (Ex. xxxi. 17.) Is it unlawful for man to do what the Creator is represented as having done? The sabbath was given as a refreshment to the sons of toil:—"That thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou:" "that the son of thine handmaid and the stranger may be refreshed,"—and to the children of toil rest is recreation, and recreation is a rest. Be this as it may, there is not a single word spoken against recreation on the sabbath in any part of the books of Moses. Our Saviour, on the Jewish sabbath, while the law for its observance was yet in full force, "walked with his disciples through the fields;" (Matt. xii. 1; Mark ii. 23; Luke vi. 1,) a cheerful and delightful recreation. Who shall say that it is sinful in his followers to do the same? On the very day of his resurrection, the first day of the week,—that is, on the day which, according to this catechism, was then become "the Christian Sabbath,"—he appeared unto two of them, "as they walked and went into the country," (Mark xvi. 12,) but we are not told that he reproved them for the sin which they were committing. Nay, it appears from the more circumstantial narrative of Luke, that *he walked with them*, till they came to Emmaus—about seven miles and a half—"*sixty furlongs.*" (Luke xxiv. 13—22.) These disciples returned to Jerusalem the same evening, and Jesus arrived there almost as soon as they; (Luke xxiv. 33—36;) making fifteen miles of travel on foot for him and them. And yet there are men in this community, "holding the tradition of the elders" of Westminster, who think themselves obliged by God's law, to use an authority with which they have been entrusted for quite a different purpose, in such a

manner as to prevent the hard-wrought mechanics of this unsavoury town from walking forth, to see the pure light and inhale the fresh breezes of heaven, on the Lord's Day, (for heaven imparts to the light its purity, and to the breeze its freshness on that as on other days,) in grounds purchased and improved by taxes, the produce of their own sweat!* Aye, and there are men who would, if they could—*but thanks be to God they have not the power*,—pass a law to prevent you and me, and your children and mine, from visiting on the Lord's Day,—which they call "the sabbath,"—our Botanic Garden, where we may contemplate and admire those bright gems of nature, the lovely flowers of the field, from which the Saviour drew such beautiful lessons of piety, humility, and trustful hope! Knowing these things, we can hardly feel surprised at the interference which has for the present put a stop to the performance of music on Sundays by military bands in the London Parks;—an interference which has done much to keep the lower orders in the metropolis in subjection to habits of sensual and degrading indulgence; while it has deprived them of a pure, refined and elevating enjoyment. But here again there is reason to apprehend that the convenience of the rich, great, and noble families whose dwellings surround some of the parks, has been consulted. They like not that crowds of humble citizens should be drawn together in their neighbourhood; and doubtless

* The reference is to the conduct of certain Commissioners appointed to procure for the town of Belfast a large supply of pure fresh water, and invested with extensive powers for that purpose, which they have neglected to exercise in such a manner as to secure the object in view. However, they have constructed some enormous reservoirs, the greater part of which is generally empty of water. A portion of the public money which has passed through their hands, they have employed in ornamenting the banks and grounds beside these reservoirs with flowers, shrubs, evergreens, &c., and in laying out walks with seats, and other elegant adjuncts. I am of opinion that the expenditure of the public money for such purposes was not authorized by law; but I am not disposed to complain of it. I do complain, however, of the regulations of the Commissioners by which this landscape-garden, which is all that the rate-payers possess in lieu of a large reservoir of water, and which has been made and adorned at the expense of all, both rich and poor, is closed against the inhabitants on the only day in the week on which the poorer rate-payers can make any use of it. That is to say, the Commissioners, having first applied the public money in such a way as not to answer the end for which it was given, and having spent a part of it so as to answer another end, for which it was not given, set themselves up as the guardians of religion, and say to the injured rate-payer,—"We will make you observe our sabbath as *we* think right, even in your own premises, bought with your own money."

their love of dignified privacy has sharpened their piety in this case.* While on this point, I cannot help adverting to a recent decision by a magistrate in one of the metropolitan police offices. A man was brought up before him who had made it a regular practice to go from church to church on Sundays, picking pockets :— the case was fully proved, and sentence was pronounced ; in doing which his worship observed " there was one point strongly in the

* Everybody now knows the history of the Sunday performances of music in the London Parks. The Prime Minister (Lord Palmerston) and several members of his Government had frequently expressed themselves in favour of affording such a cheerful and innocent recreation to the inhabitants of the Metropolis ; and at length it was notified that the bands of the regiments of Her Majesty's Guards would perform pieces of sacred music every Sunday afternoon in Kensington Gardens, Hyde Park, Regent's Park, and Victoria Park. This arrangement lasted for some weeks. The performances were attended by immense numbers of people, amounting in the aggregate to hundreds of thousands. Not the slightest impropriety of conduct was committed; and it was remarked that the public-houses were, on these occasions, comparatively deserted. Several deputations from sabbatarian societies waited on Sir B. Hall (the Chief Commissioner of Woods and Forests), to beg that the practice might be discontinued ; but he argued the point with them in a manner so conclusive, that most of them went home confessing that they had " taken nothing by their motion." But the nobility and gentry in the neighbourhood of the West-end Parks exerted their influence with members of the government ; and not in vain. Some members of Parliament intimated that they would be under the necessity of voting against ministers, if the band-playing on Sunday were not stopped ; and Lord Palmerston took advantage of a letter of remonstrance from the Archbishop of Canterbury, to get himself out of the scrape, by stating in answer to his Grace, that "in deference to public opinion, though against his own judgment, he would cause the Sunday music to be discontinued." This correspondence was clearly only an opportunity seized to thrust aside a question that might have occasioned a degree of annoyance to the ministry or some of its adherents. No one knows better than Lord Palmerston, that the great mass of public opinion was with him, and would have supported him, had he stood firmly by his own avowed sentiments. I may here add that this opposition to Sunday performances by military bands, is quite a recent thing. When I was a school-boy in the city of Londonderry, before the close of the French war, the bands of all the regiments that were successively quartered in the town, played regularly every Sunday afternoon, on the City Wall, the public promenade ; and persons of all ranks and denominations attended in large numbers, to enjoy the varied charms of conversation, music, and delightful scenery. Among the regiments, whose bands afforded, by direction of their officers, this pleasing recreation to the inhabitants, I recollect the following ; (and I name them to shew that it is a mistake to affirm that Scotland and the North of Ireland have always been opposed to military music on Sunday ;) viz., The Royal Lanark Militia, the Edinburgh Militia, the 72nd Regiment of the Line, (now Highlanders,) the Royal North Down Militia, the Royal Tyrone Militia, and the Londonderry Militia. I believe a similar treat was at that time afforded to the inhabitants of every garrison town in the United Kingdom ; and I never heard that either religion or morality suffered in consequence.

culprit's favour; namely, that he had not joined the crowds which had been employed in profaning the holy sabbath by listening to the bands of music in the parks; and consequently his punishment would be lighter than it would otherwise have been!" Thus, according to this sapient magistrate, it is a smaller crime to pick pockets in a church on the Lord's day, than to listen to the sacred strains of Handel, Haydn, and Mozart in the open air! In Sir Peter Laurie's judgment the temple not merely sanctifies the gold, but confers a degree of holiness upon the stealing of it.*

This is all very silly and very bad: but worse remains behind. The shorter catechism tells us that the sanctifying of "the Christian Sabbath" requires "the spending of *the whole time* in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is taken up in the works of necessity and mercy." Here indeed is a sabbath "with a vengeance!" Not only is attendance upon public and private worship required, about which the Fourth Commandment does not say one syllable: but we are told the sabbath is not duly sanctified unless "*the whole time*" be spent "in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much of it as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy." *Necessity and Mercy!* Why any work at all would be a work of necessity, and of mercy too, if only as a refuge from the other part of this precept. Did any man ever yet keep this precept? Did any man ever yet try to keep

* As this statement may to some appear incredible, I subjoin my authority: "SABBATARIANISM IN THE BENCH.—A notorious pickpocket was brought up the other day before one of the London magistrates. The fellow was a pious rogue, though not precisely of the class of thieves who steal Bibles. He made it a practice to visit various churches on Sunday, and while apparently engaged in the most exemplary manner at his devotions, he contrived to rob the pockets of those in his vicinity. Arrested at last, in the commission of the offence, he was searched by the police, and was found to have in his possession a series of memoranda, in which were noted his appointments for similar Sunday depredations. To ordinary moralists it would appear that this scoundrel's offence was a flagrant one, but the sagacious magistrate, in pronouncing the sentence of the Court, informed him that there was one thing in his favour—he had not been among the mobs and crowds who had assembled to hear the music in the parks on Sunday. His punishment for this reason was comparatively light. Sir Peter Laurie never had the reputation of being a Solon. His recent decision does not improve his administrative character.'—*Daily Mercury.*—Perhaps, after all, Sir Peter meant to *encourage* people to attend the band-playing, by protecting them from pickpockets, *leaving churchgoers to take care of themselves.* But was this right?

this precept, for so much as one single day? I believe in my heart not one man ever tried it. Could any plan be devised more calculated to lead men to hate the Lord's Day, and to hate God's worship, and to hate Christianity,—yea, and to hate the Great Name of God Himself,—than to tell them that Christ, Christianity, and God require them to keep a sabbath once a week, and to keep it in this horrible way? I use the word *horrible* with deliberation. The worship of God, as Christ worshipped him,—worship conducted in the cheerful spirit of Christ's religion,—is a truly delightful exercise of the heart and soul. But the most delightful exercise becomes a grinding bondage, if the mind is to be kept to it without change, cessation, or interruption, for such an interval of time. I know of no method more calculated to inspire a hatred of all that is good, than the attempt to enforce such a cruel law as this. Such a law was never made for human beings, or else it was never intended to be kept. Nothing can be imagined more directly opposed to the whole intention of the Mosaic Sabbath, which was given, not that the spirit of man should be wearied to death, but that it "might be refreshed." (Exod. xxiii. 12.)

And here I may refer to a hymn that has been composed for the use of children in Infant Schools, and which is in common use among them. It is conceived quite in the spirit of the Westminster Catechism. It goes over the list of almost all the things that are pleasing to a healthy, lively child, and denounces each as a sin *when done upon the Lord's Day; but on that day only.*

"We must not *play on Sunday,*
On Sunday, on Sunday;
We must not play on Sunday,
For that would be a sin!"

And so "we must not *sing* on Sunday," and we must not *laugh* on Sunday," for the same reason. But the hymn is careful to add that we may laugh, and sing, and play,

——————— "*On Monday,*
And Tuesday, and Wednesday,
And Thursday, Friday, Saturday,
Till Sunday comes again!"

Oh! how the unfortunate little beings must wish in their hearts,

that *Sunday would never come again!* When thus observed, it must be to them the most miserable day of all the seven.

Even if the Lord's Day were a "Christian Sabbath,"—which it is never once declared to be in the New Testament,—I should protest against this more than Jewish,—this worse than Rabbinical,—this puritanical and most intolerable manner of observing it. The sabbath was given as a consolation and refreshment to the toil-worn children of men. If we are to have a sabbath, *let it be a sabbath;* a rest; a real rest; a relief and not a burden, to the exhausted body and the wearied soul.

But I reject altogether the notion of a "Christian Sabbath." I conceive there is no such thing as a *sabbath* under the New Testament. Even on Jews believing in Christ, I conceive that the observance of the sabbatical precept is not now compulsory: and as to persons like ourselves,—Gentiles, and the descendants of heathens,—I cannot find the slightest ground for supposing that the observance of any sabbath,—Jewish or Christian—was ever required of such, by our Saviour and his Apostles. To attempt to impose such an observance, as binding upon the conscience, seems to me an intolerable assumption of authority in spiritual concerns. I dare not submit to such an usurped authority. It would in me be an act of treason against Christ, the only king and lawgiver of the Church.

How would the twelve apostles have been astonished, if they could have been told that men, professsing to be their disciples, would be found busily labouring, in season and out of season, to establish the observance of the sabbath, as binding on the whole church of Christ, till the end of time! How they would have been astonished had they learned that many such would arise in a free Christian land, who should strain their influence to the utmost, publicly and privately, to promote the passing of a law which should compel all people,—or perhaps I should say, *all poor people*,—to observe this sabbath of their own making, according to their own view of the manner in which it should be observed; and for inflicting severe penalties on such of them as presumed to omit the observance of this their sabbath, or to observe it otherwise than as they prescribed! How would their astonishment have been increased had they been told that among those clamorers for a law

to enforce compliance with this opinion of their own, were many men who were conspicuous for maintaining that the state should never intermeddle with the concerns of religion; and that, in all affairs which affect the conscience, men should be left to their own voluntary exertions, or the aid voluntarily bestowed upon them by their brethren! Yet so it is. Men who object to the payment of a schoolmaster out of the public funds, to teach the children of the poor their A, B, C,—lest the state should somehow exercise an unwarrantable influence over those children's religious faith, besiege the doors of the House of Commons, year after year, with petitions for fining and imprisoning all who do not observe "the sacred sabbath" according to their idea of its sanctity.* But the inconsistency may be explained. On the sabbath question they think they have the majority on their side, and therefore with respect to it, they are anxious for state interference. On doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions they know they are in the minority; and therefore with respect to them they will have no state interference. How they would act if they conceived they were on the powerful side in both classes of opinions, I leave it to those to determine who have carefully watched their proceedings hitherto.

If men could be brought to read the New Testament, and to think soberly and seriously on its contents, it would be quite unnecessary to argue formally, that the sabbath, in common with all the other ceremonies of the Jewish law, never was imposed on Gentile Christians by our Lord or the Twelve Apostles,—and consequently is not now binding upon us. What man is there among us that believes himself bound by the provisions of that code? Not one. We neither circumcise our children, nor offer sacrifice, nor abstain from

* The party which is anxious to force forward penal laws for fining and imprisoning those who do not observe the Sunday as a Sabbath, or observe it in a manner not sufficiently strict to please the sabbatarians' consciences,—includes, of course, many persons who are not to be ranked among the supporters of what is commonly called Voluntaryism; but it includes many of those who are. The leading men in the principal local societies in England for urging on these sabbath laws, are also the leading men in the Anti State-Church Associations. They are usually Independents, and other dissenters: in whose wake the clergy and laity of the Established Church are in this instance, content to sail. The great leader of the Sabbatarians in the centre of England is so strenuous in his Voluntaryism, that he protests against the Government setting up schools, or appointing School Inspectors at the public expense, as an interference with the rights of conscience!

forbidden food, nor practise the Mosaic purifications, nor keep the festivals, nor observe the new moons. Yet there is just as much ground in the New Testament for requiring Christians to observe all and each of these, as the sabbath; for some of them much more. Neither in fact do we, any of us, keep the sabbath,—the only sabbath that ever was prescribed or enjoined by God: for that was the seventh day, to which we pay no respect whatsoever. When it is agreed that all the other rites and ceremonies are abolished, is it not most inconsistent to maintain that the ceremony called the sabbath, which stands on the same footing with the rest. —at least on no firmer footing,—is still in force?

Our Saviour was "lord of the sabbath," and had full power to repeal it. He repeatedly did things which were regarded by the Jews as violations of the sabbath; and he justified himself on grounds which imply his power to set the law aside. "My Father worketh hitherto: and I work." (John v. 17.) God carried on his operations of nature every day in the week, and Christ was justified in following his example. As Abiathar had violated an express provision of the Mosaic code, in favour of David and his followers when hungry,—so did our Saviour avowedly violate the statute of the sabbath for the good of men, for whom the sabbath was made. (Mark ii. 25, 26.) He not only never said a single word in support of the observance of the sabbath, but he omitted it,—in a very marked and significant manner,—on occasions when, if binding *in perpetuum*, it would have been sure to be mentioned. When he was asked, "Which is the first commandment of all?"—he answered, "The first of all the commandments is, 'Hear O Israel! the Lord our God is One Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength:' this is the first commandment: and the second is like, namely this,—'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' There is none other commandment greater than these." No word of a sabbath here:—nay, he approved of the answer of the scribe who declared that these things were far superior "to whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." (Mark xii. 28, 34.) When he was asked "What good thing a man should do that he might inherit eternal life?" he briefly enumerated the *moral* commandments of the Deca-

logue ; but made no reference to the ceremonial precept,—that of the sabbath. When the Apostles and Elders and the whole church of Jerusalem took into consideration what portions of the ceremonial law it might be expedient, for peace sake, to require the Gentile believers to observe,—they named only four, viz :—that they should abstain "from meat offered to idols, and from things strangled, and from fornication, and from blood." (Acts xv. 5—29.) They never enjoined upon them as a religious duty, to keep sabbath, either on the first day of the week, or the seventh ; much less require that they should "spend the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much of it as was taken up with works of necessity and mercy." The Apostle Paul complains of the Galatians for keeping up the observance of days. "But now after that ye have known God or rather are known of him, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage! Ye observe days, and months, and times and years. I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." (Gal. iv. 9—11.) In his Epistle to the Romans, many of whom were Jews by birth, and no doubt attached to their ancient ceremonies,—others manifestly Gentiles,—he exhorts that there be no dissension on the ground of such observances. "One man," he says, "esteemeth one day above another : another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord : and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." (Rom. xiv. 5, 6.) To the Colossians he says, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink ; or in respect of a holy-day ;" (or rather *of a festival*) "or of a new moon ;—*or of sabbaths ;* which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." (Col. ii. 16, 17.) The only writer of the New Testament who speaks of the keeping of a sabbath by Christians, is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ; but his sabbath is the sabbath of heaven ; and he speaks of it in such a manner as shows that the sabbath on earth was utterly abolished. "There remaineth therefore a rest," (σαββατισμός, *the keeping of a sabbath,*) "for the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his. Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall

after the same example of unbelief." (Heb. iv. 9—11.) According to this writer, "the Christian Sabbath" is not the first day of the week; nor the seventh day of the week; nor any day of the week; much less is it a day to be spent in bitter penance and mortification in the present life. It is "the quiet of the skies;—the sabbath of our God!" It is "the rest from their labours" which the blessed enjoy,—"the dead that die in the Lord." (Rev. xiv. 13.)

But it may be asked, do I forget the passages in which we read that our Saviour met with his disciples on the first day of the week, after his resurrection; and that the early Christians met together on the same day for religious purposes? Not at all. I remember them very distinctly. Our Saviour met with his disciples *twice* on the first day of the week, on both occasions apparently in the evening. How the rest of the day was spent by them we do not know: certainly the whole it had not been spent by him, on one occasion at least, either in public or private worship of God, as has been already shewn: (see Mark xvi. 12: Luke xxiv. 13—36:) neither do we read of any act of worship having been celebrated when they were met together. This is far too inconclusive to shew that they kept the day as a sabbath, or required us to do so. Paul exhorted the Corinthians to lay aside money for a charitable collection on the first day of the week: (1 Cor. xvi. 2:) that day being *perhaps* chosen for the purpose, because it was the stated day, or one of the stated days, for their church meetings; for we know not how often they met; nor whether their meetings were always occasions of worship. But this does not suffice to shew that the Apostle had taken it upon him to alter the time specified in the Fourth Commandment from the seventh day of the week to the first; and then to enjoin it as a perpetual ordinance on all Christians, Jews and Gentiles, contrary to what he himself says in other places. Paul also preached at Troas to the disciples who had come together there to break bread. (Acts xx. 7.) This assemblage also was held after nightfall: (vss. 7 and 8:) nor are we told how the rest of the day had been occupied. These are the strongest proofs of the alleged transference of the sabbath to the first day of the week; and they do not prove it. Can any reasoning be more inconclusive than that which would build a new sabbath, "to continue to the end of the world," on such texts?

On the other hand, we know for certain that the risen Saviour met with his disciples on other days than the first day of the week; —or if on the first day of the week, that it was not observed as a sabbath. He met with Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, James and John, and two other disciples, by the lake of Tiberias: they had been busy at their work as fishermen: "they had toiled all night, but caught nothing." He gave them directions which enabled them to make a most successful draught. (John xxi. 1—22.) Did our Lord assist his disciples to violate by their labour the sanctity of "the Christian Sabbath?" If not, then either this meeting did not take place on the first day of the week, or else the first day of the week was not a sabbath. The Saviour met with the disciples "forty days" after his resurrection, and led them out to Bethany, and ascended to heaven before their eyes. (Luke xxiv. 50; Acts i. 3—9.) According to our manner of computing time, the fortieth day after the resurrection would fall upon Friday; according to that which was in use among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, it would be Thursday; but no calculation that was ever in use among men, could make it happen on a Sunday.* At the time of the effusion of the Holy Spirit, the disciples "were all with one accord in one place." (Acts ii. 1—4.) This was on the day of Pentecost, the Feast of Weeks, or the Feast of Harvest, as it is called in the Old Testament. (Exodus xxiii. 16; compare xxxiv. 22.) A festival which took place on the fiftieth (or as we calculate time, on the *forty-ninth*) day after the 16th of Abib—the Passover being on the evening after the 14th day of that moon. Now the Passover, on the evening of which our Lord was arrested, fell upon a

* In their computations of time, all the ancient nations of the world counted a fraction of a day as a whole day: and in reckoning a series of ordinals, (second day, third, &c.) included the day *from* which they counted, as well as that *to* which they counted:—hence if two events happened on successive Tuesdays, for example, the second would be said to have happened eight days after the first, or on the eighth day after the first, indifferently. Of this usage there are several examples in Scripture, and almost innumerable in classical writings. Now the day of the Homer,—or of the wave sheaf,—or of the offering of the first fruits of the ripe ears of corn, always took place on the next day but one after that on the evening of which the passover was eaten: (Lev. xxiii. 4—15:) and the day of Pentecost,—called in the Old Testament the "Feast of Weeks," or the "Feast of Harvest," fell on that day seven weeks; which, according to their computation, was the fiftieth day after the day of Homer, though we should call it the forty-ninth.

Thursday,*—the Pentecost, therefore, must have been on a Saturday,—and the ingenious theologians who have laboured to prove that it was on a Sunday, have only bewildered themselves and others to no purpose.

There is, in short, no ground whatever for alleging that any precept was delivered by our Saviour or any of his Apostles, for the observance of a sabbath on the first day of the week ;† or any day of the week. That he met with his disciples *twice* after his resurrection on on what *we* call the first day of the week, is certain.‡ But he met with them also at other times. That some of the early Christians were in the habit of meeting together for worship, and other needful purposes, on the first day of the week, seems to me

* It appears from Matthew, Mark, and Luke, that our Saviour and his disciples celebrated the Passover on Thursday evening. The day of Homer, or of the wave-sheaf, would therefore fall on *Saturday*:—and the day of Pentecost would necessarily be on Saturday also. It has, nevertheless, been argued stoutly that it fell on a Sunday ;—because it is mentioned by the Evangelist John that the high-priest and his confederates had not yet eaten the Passover on Friday morning, but were to eat it afterwards. (John xviii. 28.) They were, in fact, to eat it on the evening *of that day*: (John xix—14.) As their Passover fell on Friday evening, *their* Pentecost would fall on a Sunday; and accordingly it is maintained that the Pentecost mentioned in Acts ii. 1. happened on a Sunday. There was a difference of opinion among the Jews as to the manner of ascertaining the appearance of the new moon, (on which the celebration of all these feasts depended,) that enables us easily to explain this discrepancy. But as we know that such a discrepancy existed, it is perfectly unwarranted to suppose that in fixing the day of Pentecost, the disciples of Christ would desert *his* principle of calculation, and adopt that of his murderers:—and even if we suppose that some of them might have done so, it is quite unjustifiable to imagine that Luke should have followed one rule for fixing the time of new moon in his Gospel and another in the Acts, without giving any notice of the change.

† The "Sabbath Alliance" which was instituted at Edinburgh on the 1st of Nov., 1847, makes the following concession respecting the alleged change of the sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week:—"*There is no special enactment in the New Testament regarding this change.*" (Tract No. IV. p. 3.) The concession is of little worth; for the fact is quite undeniable; but it shows a glimmer of light amidst very thick darkness on this subject.

‡ The two appearances of our Saviour on the evening of his resurrection and a week afterwards, are said by St. John to have occurred on the evening of "the first day of the week." (John xx. 19.) We may here suppose the venerable evangelist, who, when he wrote his Gospel, had probably been for many years absent from Palestine, to have followed the division of days common among the Greeks among whom he lived: probably at Ephesus. According to the Jewish calculation, the evening of Sunday would strictly form part of the second day of the week. Yet a similar expression is found in Lev. xxiii. 5, in reference to the Passover. "In the fourteenth day of the first month, at even, is the Passover of Jehovah:" *i.e.* on the evening *after* the fourteenth day.

highly probable: but they were also "with one accord in one place" on another day. Paul preached to the disciples at Troas on the evening of the first day of the week:—but he also preached very frequently to the Jews in their synagogues, on their Sabbath. Those who can find in the book which records these facts, any ground for attaching peculiar sanctity to one day in the week above another, have read it with sharper eyes than mine. On the other hand, they overlook much that discountenances all such notions.

It is possible that many persons, when they hear (or read) these statements, will think that I am broaching new theories of my own;—that I am ambitious of singularity;—that I stand alone or nearly so in these views;—and am especially contradicting a principle which has been held sacred among Protestant theologians since the Reformation. But the fact is quite the reverse: and persons who are moderately acquainted with theology must be aware that I am only defending an opinion which was held by all the learned and illustrious divines of the Reformation, with few exceptions;—so far as I know, with none. It would weary your patience if I were to read to you the statements of Luther, Melanchthon, Zuinglius, Œcolampadius, Bucer, Calvin, Beza, Tyndale, Frith, Cranmer, Ridley, Bishop Aylmer, Chillingworth, Milton, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Priestley, Dr. J. Pye Smith, Dr. Arnold, Archbishop Whately, and, to a certain extent, even John Knox, the Reformer of Scotland. If time permitted, I could very easily let you see that all these illustrious men adopted every opinion that can be regarded as of any importance in the argument that I have now laid before you.* There are many, as I have reason to believe, not merely among laymen, but among divines, who concur with them and me; but who have not said, and will not say, a word at this time,—*because they fear men.* Possibly there are some also who *love* men more than they fear them, and perhaps some of these may speak their sentiments.

What then are the opinions and views respecting the Lord's Day

* I had intended to give, in an Appendix, some extracts from the leading divines in this list; and most readers would be struck with their unanimity on this question; and also with the force with which they have expressed themselves upon it:—but I find they would occupy too much space, and I reserve them for any future publication that circumstances may render necessary. I only say feebly what these men have said strongly.

by which I should wish you and your fellow-Christians to be guided? They are briefly these.

Let it be maintained as a day of public prayer and public worship. These are religious duties which nature herself prompts, prescribes, and enjoins. It is evident that if they are to be observed, some time must be set apart by common consent for their observance. No time can be more suitable than that which is already established by common usage in every Christian country, and which there is certain proof has been employed for this purpose from the end of the first century after our Lord's resurrection,* and probably from a still earlier date;—a day which was undoubtedly employed for this purpose by one Christian Society, at least, and probably by two, in the very times of the Apostles.

But although the Lord's Day be observed as a day of worship, it is not necessarily to be in all respects a sabbath. It is, however, most desirable that it should be, as far as may be consistent with the true happiness of mankind at large, a day of rest from worldly pursuits and avocations. Let all who wish to enjoy the holy influence springing from the worship of God, keep themselves in a suitable frame for doing so, by breaking off the train of secular cares which are only too apt to engross our minds on other days; and give the fresh impulses of their heart to the service of their God. Religion should have fair play in our souls; and it has not fair play if the worldly cares, which necessarily, and therefore innocently, engross so much of our time and thoughts on other days, are allowed to intrude even upon the one day in seven that we allow ourselves for spiritual purposes.

* Justin Martyr says,—"And on the day which is called [the day] of the Sun, there is a meeting together of all [Christians] who dwell either in towns or in country places: and the Memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the prophets are read, as time permits, and the President makes an address, exhorting" &c., &c. He gives the reasons why they came together on this day of the week: which are, that on it God dispelled primeval darkness by the creation of light; and that on it our Saviour Jesus Christ rose from the dead. He does not plead any divine command as requiring the practice; nor does he speak of any sabbatical observance of the day. Indeed, had the early Christians observed the Lord's Day in a sabbatical manner, their doing so would have marked them out to their enemies in times of persecution. But no historian, so far as I am aware, mentions any instance of their having incurred danger in this way. Justin Martyr wrote about A.D. 140; that is, little more than a century after the resurrection of Christ.

What it ought to be to ourselves, it ought to be for our fellow-creatures,—our domestics, our workmen, our labourers, and others in our employment. To require of them any labour in our service, for our convenience or our profit, which interferes with a due preparation of the heart for the solemn exercises of the Lord's House and the Lord's Day, is exceedingly inconsistent; and, in my opinion, highly blameable. Let us, by our example, and by a suitable arrangement of our business and theirs, encourage them to seek on this day the churches of the God and Father of All, and to praise him and to bless him. The churches which they will generally frequent will probably be very different in many respects from our own; but still they are the churches of their free choice. In this land of liberty they cannot be otherwise. Let us shew that we can revere in them the holiness of the religious feeling, even under a form, to our own consciences most repugnant, by removing, as far as we can, every obstacle to its manifestation and to its culture. I am more pained than I can express when I see a difficulty that could be avoided thrown in the way of any Christian, high or low, that would prevent him from engaging in the public worship of God. The day of public worship certainly ought to be,—so far as is possible, consistently with the general good,—a day of leisure; a day of cessation from labour, work, and worldly care.

It is not to be a day of gloom. It would be a day of gloom and sadness if we were required to devote every moment and every thought to the public and private exercises of God's worship. These exercises can, in my opinion, be very acceptably and edifyingly performed in a comparatively short period of time,—indeed far more usefully and improvingly than if they are made to occupy a long one. These exercises themselves, though serious and earnest, are the reverse of depressing: on the contrary, they are cheering, strengthening, and elevating. Melancholy is very far from being a fit preparation for them, or a natural consequence from them. A genial cheerfulness of spirit is by all means to be cherished on those parts of the day of prayer which are not actually engaged in the solemnities of God's worship.

But perfect idleness is incompatible with cheerfulness of mind; the mind must therefore have some occupation on those parts of the

day which are not actually employed in God's worship;—*not worldly occupation*, for the reasons already given,—and *not of such a nature as to interfere with the special object* for which the day is set apart. There are many such occupations, in which we ought to encourage our fellow-creatures freely to engage.

The devising and executing plans for the enlightenment of our fellow-men, and for the mitigation of their sorrows and distresses, is a most suitable employment for a part of the Lord's Day. To attend the Sunday-school as a teacher or as a learner, is surely not merely permissible, but praiseworthy; and to study beforehand the subjects which are there to be considered, with a view to the more efficient discharge of the duties of the school, is right. The business of a religious society, an ecclesiastical body, a Christian congregation, a mission—foreign or domestic—can be transacted on no day more fitting. I would say the same of a charitable society, a relief fund, or an hospital. Our Saviour repeatedly shewed by his conduct that even the strictness of the Jewish sabbatical law offered no impediment to the performance of duties similar to these; and to feel any scruple about engaging in them on the Lord's Day, is a mark of gross superstition. Nor is it only in connection with public institutions that such employments may be pursued. If we can counsel those who stand in need of our advice, assist those who require our help, or cheer those whose circumstances call for our sympathy, in our private circle, and more especially in our domestic circle, we are bound to do so on the Lord's Day as on every day. Nay, the Lord's is especially adapted for the purpose; because our minds and theirs may be more reasonably expected to be in a proper frame to perform such services faithfully, and to benefit by them sincerely and permanently.

I would impress it upon parents, and those who are placed in charge over young persons, that they should endeavour to mark the Lord's Day with more frequent and more striking manifestations of their affection than usual. Let children be so trained that they will always look forward to its return with pleasing anticipations. Let the light of love shine even more brightly than at other times in your dwellings, and let the warm glow of tenderness and sympathy be felt in every heart Let it not be made a day of restraint;

but a day of endearment and of genial sympathy with their innocent enjoyments.

But, after all that presents itself in the way of these duties has been done, and after sufficient time has been devoted to those special religious exercises both public and private, for which the day is kept apart from other days,—some time will in most cases remain, on the proper use of which much may depend for good or ill. I would not merely tolerate but encourage, at such times, recreation of body and mind; provided that it be such as is innocent in itself, and not of a character to interfere with the sanctifying impression which the whole day and all its engagements ought to leave on our own hearts, and those of others. Excess in food and drink, gambling and betting, cruel sports, lewd or profane language, are sinful at all times: and I would go as far as public opinion would go with me, in my endeavours to prevent these things, and put them down, on the Day of Prayer. To attempt to go farther, would frustrate my own efforts. I would also discountenance and discourage recreations, which, though not directly sinful, are likely to be the means of inducing a state of thought and feeling that would unfit the heart for the worship of God. Here it is quite impossible to lay down any universal rule, for every thing depends on the mental state of the individual—his previous habits and training. To persons who have been brought up in the habits and with the feelings which prevail among ourselves, in this quarter of the country, things would be offensive and injurious, which in foreign lands, and even in the southern part of our own island, are practised without the slightest injury to the religious feelings of any one. But there are some recreations which, in my opinion, are perfectly suitable to the purpose of the day, and to the state of feeling which prevails in the mass of the community; and against which nothing but pharisaic precision would set its face. Let the labourer, the artisan, and the mechanic, take their wives and children to walk out into the country, —to taste the sweet air as it blows over the fields and meadows, and comes charged with health and refreshment. Let them survey the lovely scenes of nature, which they have so seldom an opportunity of contemplating at other times. A stroll on a summer's Sunday afternoon along the mountains which skirt one side of our beautiful

bay, or over the hills which bound the landscape on the other, will do good to their bodies and their souls; and will do much to aid the impression that has been left upon them by the "morning portion" of the word of God that they have read in their families, and the addresses that they have heard in their churches, if these latter have been good for anything. If they can afford to take a little excursion, by a Railway or other conveyance, let them do it by all means. Unquestionably this cannot be done, unless the officers of these establishments sacrifice a portion of their Sunday leisure. But those who think it right to keep thousands of domestic servants busy *all day* in attendance upon a few private families, can hardly object to keeping a few persons occupied, during *a part* of it, in attendance upon thousands. Let public gardens, ornamental grounds and parks be kept open on the Sunday afternoons, for the benefit of those who have a right to use them. I would even advise an extension of the privilege of admission on that day, to persons of all ranks, who may be recommended as not likely to abuse the privilege. Museums of Natural History should be thrown open for the inspection of all classes, under the same condition. Musical performances by military or other bands, in the open air,—or if the weather be unfavourable, in covered buildings or arcades,—seem to me a recreation not only innocent in itself, but in perfect harmony with the objects of the day: and I hope the time is not distant when it will be afforded to thousands in every large town throughout the dominions of our gracious Queen. She enjoys this pleasing gratification herself every Sunday afternoon, at her stately palace of Windsor: and I am certain she would feel a sincere delight in bringing it within the reach of the humblest of the dwellers in the cottages of her realm.

But some may not have the means of gratifying their taste in this manner, or may feel a wish for recreations of a different kind. Let them then employ a part of the day of leisure in improving their minds; enlarging their stock of knowledge; strengthening their intellectual powers and moral perceptions; and in preparing themselves for active usefulness in the various walks of life. They can be at no loss for materials of thought suited to every capacity and every mental habitude. Let them give their attention to the study of religion and its history; to the Bible and works which are designed

to illustrate its contents; and to writings which are calculated to inspire a love of truth, and a holy admiration for what is excellent; to remove errors, prejudices, and narrow views, and to elevate the mind while they expand the heart. Let them investigate the wonders of nature, as displayed alike in the grandest and most minute of her operations. Let the dealings of God's providence and the result of man's passions, base or noble, as unfolded in history, be studied. Let eloquence and poetry too, such as ennoble and purify the heart, and spiritualize man's thought,—not such as degrade and corrupt alike their authors and their readers,—find a season for perusal, and afford food for meditation. I pity the man who can see only a subject of censure in the conduct of his neighbour, who devotes a part of the Sunday afternoon to reading a book of the *Paradise Lost*, or a chapter of Macaulay's *History of England*. In recommending such studies it will be borne in mind that I recommend them only so far as they are a recreation to the weary mind; not to be pursued on Sunday to such an extent as to make the pursuit itself a labour, fatiguing and exhausting those powers which it would be my desire to see refreshed. I would make them a help, not a hindrance to devotion. I would recommend them as a supplement, not a substitute, for the religious exercises of the Lord's Day.

No one knows better than myself that I am not likely to find, in this parson-bestridden town, any very general expression of concurrence in opinions, which almost all the ministers of the various churches amongst us, have, for the last twenty years, being doing their utmost to discountenance and put down. But I have thought it right to state them freely now, as I have often done before; satisfied that in time they will produce their effect upon thoughtful minds. There are two points which I deem of special importance, and with the enunciation of them I close this long discourse.

The first is, that whatever be our views of the Lord's Day, and the proper manner of observing it,—it is as impolitic as it is disgraceful and sinful, to attempt to enforce them by penal enactments. A religious sentiment cannot be implanted by law; nor can it be strengthened by an Act of Parliament. If you send a man whom you call a sabbath-breaker to the prison, the stocks, or the pillory, you only make him hate you and your sabbath. He knows in his

heart that you have no right to try to compel him by such means, or by any means, to adopt your religious observances, or any religious observances. He sees that such penalties are never inflicted except on persons in humble life; and he begins to suspect that all religion is but a pretence; that in reality it is but a contrivance to keep him and persons in his rank of life, "in order;" that is, to *keep them down:*—and so by trying to force him to be religious after your pattern, you drive him into hostility against all religion. Were such methods of persuasion allowable, the policeman and the jailor would be the most effective teachers of religion. Let the methods of persuasion to a religious employment of the day, be suitable to the nature of religion itself; and therefore, mild, rational, and humane.

My second remark is, that if we wish to support the interests of religion, we must not present her to our fellow-men with a frowning brow, scowling on the pure and innocent enjoyments of life; but rather as a blessed companion, whose presence cheers and animates all her associates,—dissipates the dark clouds of despondence, and irradiates life with the bright beams of love, joy, and hope. By teaching our fellow-Christians to look on the Lord's Day, not as a fast but as a festival,—not as a day of gloom but as a day of cheerful enjoyment,—we shall do far more towards inspiring a love for it, and a genuine healthy spirit of religion in their breasts, than if we set to them, in our own persons, an example of gloomy austerity, and placed ourselves in bitter opposition to the innocent recreations of our fellow-creatures, especially the sons and daughters of toil, who have so many claims on our fraternal sympathy. Indeed if our tempers are gloomy and our manners morose, we show that we are not truly religious ourselves; and we deter others from seeking to become so. The true Christian has, of all men, the best reason to be cheerful; yea, even "to rejoice with a joy unspeakable and full of glory."

ALEX. MAYNE, PRINTER, HIGH-STREET, BELFAST.

THE

DESIGN,

FULNESS, AND BLESSEDNESS

OF

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans;

A DISCOURSE

PREACHED AT MANCHESTER, AUGUST 13, 1815.

BY THE

REV. HENRY MOORE.

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE METHODIST CONFERENCE.

O Timotheus, keep that which is committed to thy trust.—St. Paul.

LONDON:

PRINTED AT THE CONFERENCE-OFFICE, 14, CITY-ROAD,

BY THOMAS CORDEUX, AGENT.

SOLD BY T. BLANSHARD, 14, CITY-ROAD; ALSO, BY THE METHODIST PREACHERS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY.

1816.

PREFACE.

WHEN that *burning and shining light* of the Church of Scotland, Mr. Haliburton, was on his death-bed, he said to his learned and pious brethren who visited him, "O Sirs, I dread mightily that a rational sort of religion is coming in among us; a religion that consists wholly in moral duties and ordinances, without the *power of Godliness:* a way of serving God which is mere Deism, having no relation to Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of God." This religion, so called, had got into England some time before, about the period when Charles the Second was restored. The nation then hastened from turbulent, ambitious enthusiasm and hypocrisy, to a kind of Atheism, a formal religion without God. Many even made a merit of the change. The great truths of the gospel were exploded, as leading to fanaticism and rebellion; and some did not like to speak of God at all, because his name had been so grievously taken in vain. The effects of this system on the nation at large were most deplorable, and deeply lamented by the great Mr. Baxter, and other excellent men, who lived to see the melancholy change.

Among the sober part of these new reformers, some appeared to have a concern for religion. Of these, the

celebrated Mr. Locke became the Apostle. His rational system just answered their views, and was an apology for the new dispensation. On the Continent also his writings were well received. Michaelis and others embraced his creed, and thus laid the foundation of the celebrity of the half-infidel critics of the German school. The system was matured and methodized by Dr. Taylor of Norwich; and has been lately improved by Dr. Paley and others. Dr. Priestley proceeded with more boldness. He seemed to consider the Christian Religion, and indeed the whole theory of Divine Revelation, as lying within the level of his critical powers, as much as any branch of mere human science whatsoever. He was not content with examining the *evidences*, but would bend the *Revelation itself* to his judgment.

What *deceivableness of unrightcousness* is manifest in all this! How ensnaring is this whole system, seeing we are so apt to have high thoughts of ourselves, and low thoughts of God,—of his law and of his gospel! But if we allow, that the one foundation of our hope is, *God manifest in the flesh*, and that all our inward and outward righteousness flows from the almighty Spirit of God, then how dangerous is any notion of religion without these? How abortive too, in this case, are all the means of grace appointed by the Lord,—for they are all professedly given *to raise the fallen; to bind up the broken in heart; to bring a clean thing out of an unclean;* to bring guilty, sinful, helpless man to God! How deceitfully pleasing to the *natural man* is even that plain, but most important mean, the *Word of God*, when he reads or hears it as a critic, and not as a condemned or diseased creature!

The consequence of this antichristian divinity was, that *darkness covered the land, and gross darkness the people.*

But the remnant still lifted up their voice, and the Lord heard. Just then, when there seemed to be no hope, He began a work of grace in the University of Oxford; a work which still goes on, and shall proceed while sun and moon endure. A few young men, who explored the divine volume, from the only right motive, a single desire to save their own souls, were made the unintentional instruments of this great work. Mr. JOHN WESLEY was the first and chief of those persons thus honoured by the Lord. He at first sought, but with the greatest sacrifices, and the most entire devotedness, to know God, as a scholar. "I not only," says he, "read, but studied the Bible; and became, *Homo unius libri*, a man of one book." But after the most unremitting and painful efforts, with the most mortifying defeats, he obtained true self-knowledge, and took the right way. He sought the Lord as a guilty, sinful, helpless creature, *in whom dwelt no good thing*. To all who are thus *poor in spirit*, God *reveals* himself; and this humbled sinner soon found him to be the *Saviour*, the powerful *Saviour of the lost!* Being thus prepared by *the Spirit of truth and love in Christ Jesus*, and being previously fitted by education, high classical attainments, and vast powers of mind, to maintain that truth, (to which these talents were now all subjected,) not only against the ignorant and ungodly world, but *against the oppositions of science, falsely so called*; the Lord, who is rich in mercy to all the lost race, led him, contrary to his inclination and habits, into a line of public usefulness, that in its effects, not only with respect to his own, but other communities, bids fair to evangelize the earth. In the course of his extended works of love, he met with the laboured writings of Dr. Taylor, the chief apostle of that vain philosophy that had imposed on so many, and introduced a counterfeit gospel. The eye of the

man of God penetrated at once the deep, refined infidelity of that plausible writer. Full of the wisdom from above, he "attacked it from end to end;" exposed all its fallacies; demonstrated its earthly origin; and, to use the words of his admirable coadjutor, the Rev. Mr. Fletcher, of Madeley, one of the first scholars in Europe, (but a true disciple of the cross, and content to know nothing else among men, unless compelled,) "he produced a masterly refutation of the wisest Pelagian and Socinian of the age."

A people raised up by the labours of such a man, and fostered by his sons in the gospel, have hitherto been in little danger of embracing the dogmas of that school, thus exposed to deserved contempt. All danger, however, is not precluded. Mr. Baxter observes, that nations change their religious sentiments as they do their common customs and manners; and he wonders that the same versatility should be found even in Ministers. Undoubtedly it will be found in those who are ministers of men, and not of God; nor are even His ministers secure, except while they *watch and pray*, and are "men of one book." It is certain, that a latitude of interpretation has been lately indulged, respecting the Sacred Oracles, which seems to threaten even those who are called out of the world. At the last Conference, and for some time before, the conversation of the Preachers turned much upon this subject, and deep regret was expressed that those who were highly esteemed for their piety and talents, should thus listen to the dreams of men. The surprise also was great, that those who were themselves *sound in the faith*, and professing, with strong marks of sincerity, *the call*, *the adoption*, and *the witness of God*, should manifest such a contradiction between their judgment and taste, and their Christian experience and profession!

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans was the chief theme in those conversations; and the design, fulness, and blessedness of that rich display of the mind of God towards fallen man, rested with such weight upon my mind, that when I was appointed to preach, it seemed to me that I could take no other subject. I had long considered that Epistle as exhibiting God's design to beat down all glorying in the flesh,* and to *establish the one faith* of all who truly call Him Lord; and also to demonstrate, to all generations, that in truth the Christian Revelation has no religious polity whatsoever attached to it; and has, in that respect, no more to do even with the preparatory institutes of Moses, than it can have with the infidel and worldly system of Mahomed.

For a discourse thus delivered, on such a subject, without any actual preparation, and while immersed in the business of the Conference, I really thought an apology was necessary. My surprise therefore was great, when I was called upon, by a unanimous vote of the Conference, to publish my Sermon. To comply, and promise to gather up the hasty effusion, in the best manner I could, (for I had not written a sentence of it,) was all the return I could make to such a request, so entirely unexpected.

I was sensible, previous to my delivering the Discourse, that merely to exhibit the design, or even the fulness, the vast comprehension of the Epistle, would be very uninteresting to many of my hearers: hence I saw the necessity of choosing my text from the Apostle's description of the triumph of that design, in the faith, the hope, the love, the

* The first Epistle to the Corinthians is written with the same design, especially the four first chapters. But these chapters come under the head of *correction*, rather than of the promulgation of *doctrine*, 2 Tim. iii. 16. By these the Apostle calls that people back to the doctrine which he had personally delivered to them, when he preached at Corinth.

blessedness of true believers, who beholding with unveiled face the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. a subject long familiar to my mind. If the discourse should be made a blessing to those who enjoy these glorious privileges, and stimulate others to seek them, and preserve both from doubtful disputations, my warmest wishes will be abundantly gratified.

Liverpool, December 1, 1815.

THE

DESIGN,

FULNESS, AND BLESSEDNESS

OF

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

ROMANS VIII. 35.

Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?

IT has not seemed good to the Holy Ghost to give to his Church any record whereby we may know how the Gospel was first declared at Rome. We have such records concerning other churches, who were favoured with apostolic teaching: that at Rome is a striking exception. We are certain, however, that the Apostle's mind was much occupied respecting that people. *I thank my God*, says he, *that your faith is spoken of throughout the world.* The common hyperbole is used. He praised God that throughout the Roman empire the encouraging sound was heard, that there were Christians in the Imperial City; at that time the mistress of the world; the focus and centre of arts, civilization, and splendour. The Roman eagle had preceded the cross, and by crushing the petty kingdoms, with their feuds and jealousies, civil and religious, had, by its one great authority, made the way of Truth possible. The Apostle was gratefully sensible of this, being himself repeatedly rescued, by that authority, from the power of

a jealousy cruel as the grave, and enabled to propagate that truth (though with much contention,) which makes its way through all creaturely domination.

Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world. Had the pretensions of Rome, manifested in after ages, been really of Him, would he not have taken care, by a suitable embassy, and a certain record, to have favoured those pretensions? If indeed Roman imperial dominion was to give place to Papal,—and instead of a faith which makes all things of God, a *kingdom of this world*, with a visible human head, should be established; and a faith in him, and in his church, should be imposed upon men as *the faith of God's elect*,—we should no doubt have seen the stamina of that domination, with the high title of "Vicar of Christ upon earth," in the first display of the gospel to that people. Instead of this, an obscurity, and what men would call a meanness, is observable in every thing that relates to the gospel, as sent to Imperial Rome. No power, civil or ecclesiastical, is contemplated. The wisdom of *the stable, the manger, and the cross*, what St. Paul calls, *the foolishness of God*, is exhibited in the acts of the *Holy Ghost*, as it had been in the personal appearance and ministry of *the Word*. The seed of the kingdom of the Messiah is thus sown without observation; and when at length an Apostle is sent, he appears in the lowest degree of human degradation: not barely as *the filth of the world, and the offscouring of all things*, but as a malefactor, chained to a soldier, so that he might at Rome also be counted *a murderer; whom, though he had escaped the raging of the sea, yet vengeance would not suffer to live. The servant is as his Lord; despised and rejected of men, who hid their faces from him:* the carnal mind is strengthened by his appearance. The Rabbies and Philosophers, with their earthly systems, are again held in honour. The appearance of the Embassador of God, analagous to *the preaching of the cross*, is thus *foolishness to those who perish;* while *to the called*, to *those who believe*, and in that faith *are ordained to eternal life;* the seceders from the world, who

at the sound of the gospel fall into the Redeemer's ranks,* to *fight the good fight of faith*, the whole exhibition appears with the splendour of truth. The voice of Emmanuel is heard in the lowly embassy, *giving no uncertain sound, My kingdom is not of this world!* This wisdom Paul also saw in the love of those disciples of the cross who came out to meet him, and *were not ashamed of his chain.* It evidenced that Christ was in Rome before him, and *he thanked God, and took courage.*

Behold the continued *wisdom of God in a mystery, which none of the princes of this world*, civil or religious, *knew!* In its first manifestation, *when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman;* God with God was man with men. But even this high display was but preparatory. *It was expedient that even He should go away, that the Comforter might come.* Hence our Lord so carefully sowed the seeds of this superior faith in the souls of his sincere, but ignorant and carnal disciples. Calling them off from *walking by sight*, even when he himself was the object of it, he directs them to Him who *should dwell with them and be in them; who should abide with them for ever; who should lead them into all truth;* who should give them eyes to see, and hearts to feel, what eyes of flesh and blood, with all their advantages of information, *have not seen, nor ear heard*, and *which hath not entered into the heart*, the wisest heart, *of man to conceive, but which God should reveal by his Spirit*, now first made known, and promised as a PERSON; *who should not*, however, *speak of Himself*, (that perhaps is reserved for eternity,) but *who should glorify Him, who should take of the things of Christ and* thus *shew to them His unsearchable riches.* Thus their faith was to be purified, which too much looked to those things that were natural in their Divine Master, who was soon *to be known after the flesh no more.* By this superior faith, they became *as weaned children*, soon to rise above the *beggarly elements of this world!* Privileged to see the Atonement in

* Such is the import and force of the original expression. Acts xiii. 48.

the light of God, and to claim the Eternal Father as theirs by his own adopting Spirit! to enjoy a life unknown to human nature since the fall of man!—*a life hid with Christ in God*,—issuing in a glorious hope, that *when Christ, who was their life, should appear, they also should appear with him in glory!*

A fulness of time for this display of the advent of *God the Spirit*, was also appointed by the wisdom of God. *When the day of Pentecost was fully come*, that feast which was appointed to honour the holy law of God, as given from Sinai;—behold! a love and a power, by which only the *righteousness of the law can be fulfilled in us*, descends openly and manifestly, *by a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and by tongues of fire*, on an assembly of believers prepared by the personal ministry of the Son of God! That ministry which, as in the Sermon on the Mount, confounds and abases all the wisdom of this world, and convinces all of sin! By opening also the wisdom of God to their view, in his farewell discourse, (John xiv.–xvi.) and by the prayer of God, (John xviii.) in which *the glorious liberty of the Sons of God* is described in its high origin and process, the Redeemer invited their needy souls to *drink of the river that maketh glad the city of God!* Behold! this love and this power are given! The men, thus prepared, *were with one accord in one place, having continued in prayer* for the fulfilment of the promise given at the time of their Lord's ascent. *In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, God, who caused the light to shine out of darkness, shines into their dark minds, giving them the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. They are changed and renewed in the spirit of their mind; while a hope full of immortality, maketh them not ashamed*, but *crucifies them to the world*, with all its fears, cares, and desires;—*Christ is all and in all!*

Behold also the congregation which the wisdom of God prepared for those preachers, thus ordained by the Holy Ghost! Not the giddy multitude only, who came to the feast to seek "their senses or their passions' food," and who

could ascribe this display of God's glory, *this treasure given to the earthen vessel*, to the operation of *new wine!* No; but *devout men, from every nation under heaven!* Men who had looked at themselves in the glass of God's law; who trembled at his word; who contemplated eternity; and who, like the great master of science, and like all men of great understanding, pronounced death to be "the most terrible of all terrible things!" The Lord had brought these together; and among them were found *strangers from Rome, Jews and proselytes.* Like the Magi, who came to do homage to the infant King of Israel, they lightly esteemed the dangers of the way, the boisterous deep, the inhospitable desert, or *the hills of the robbers!* and they *are not sent empty away.* These trembling disciples of convincing truth, at length find *the truth which maketh them free.* While their contrite hearts cry out, *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* The plain preacher answers, *not in the deceitful words of man's wisdom, but in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth, Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out; that the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord! Him hath God exalted with his own right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins.*

Faith cometh by hearing, especially to those prepared souls *who have the sentence of death in themselves.* They believe! they rejoice! they praise the Lord! With the three thousand, they lift up their voice, and give *glory to Him who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb! But shall they hide his righteousness within their hearts?* No: *out of the abundant fulness of a loving heart the mouth speaketh.* They return home *bearing precious seed*,—the seed of happiness, present and eternal. Rome beholds her portion of these evangelized men, after their toilsome journey,

Happy if with their latest breath they may but gasp His name!

Unlike the disputers of this world, they have *happiness* to offer to their friends, relatives, and neighbours. *They have found Him, of whom Moses and the Prophets did write.*

They are full fraught with Christ in a pure believing heart! *The truth is received in the love of it,—there is joy in heaven,*—there is joy in Rome,—*there is joy and gladness in the dwellings* of this little flock; and the infant Church thus formed, though not privileged with the presence, the teaching, or the pastoral care of any apostle, stands immovable by truth and love, *on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone!*

I. The Church in the East heard the glad sound; and *the Apostle of the Gentiles,* who was *debtor to the Jews and to the Greeks, to the wise and to the unwise,* longed over those precious souls, in the Imperial City, *with the bowels of Jesus Christ. God,* says he, *is my witness how incessantly I make mention of you in my prayers, always requesting that I may come to you, if by any means now at length I may have a prosperous journey by the will of God. For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, that ye may be established.* With such gifts the Corinthians and other Churches, who had enjoyed the presence of the Apostle, abounded. In this respect, the flock at Rome were greatly inferior to those Churches. The Apostle by writing, would make up the deficiency. *He wrote to build them up in their most holy faith; that they might know what was the hope of their calling, and what the riches of the glory of the Lord, in his inheritance in the saints; and what the exceeding greatness of his power in those who believe, according to the energy of his mighty power, which he exerted in Christ, raising him from the dead, and seating him,* in our assumed nature, *at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come.*

The believers at Rome were renewed in love, but *a renewal in knowledge* was also their privilege. Here we see the DESIGN of this Epistle, so different from all others. The Apostle would give to those teachable spirits the information which they needed, and lay the true *foundation*

upon which to *build the holy temple.* The Holy Ghost sanctions the distinction. Speaking to the Corinthians, the Apostle recalls to their remembrance his teaching when among them. *As a wise master-builder,* says he, *I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon.* The danger that might arise from this diversity of teaching, he thus strikingly illustrates:—*Let every man take heed how he buildeth thereon. For other foundation can no man lay,* with safety, *than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus. If any man build on this foundation, gold, silver, and precious stones,* (the whole work of the Spirit,) *or wood, hay, stubble,* (the doctrines, forms, or inventions of men,) *every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it;* the great day of God shall declare it to all the world. *Yea, it is revealed;* it is near, though distant: faith beholds it. *It is revealed by fire; for the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.* The strict process of that day will try every man's doctrines whether they come up to the standard of God. The deplorable effects of this incongruous building were seen in the Churches of Galatia. When *Jesus Christ,* by the plain, but powerful preaching of the Apostle, *was evidently set forth as crucified among them, a blessedness* rested on their believing souls. Their grateful love to God, who had thus wonderfully loved them, overflowed to the instrument of their happiness. *I bear you witness,* says the Apostle, *that, if possible, you would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me!* But *another gospel* was preached to these simple, loving believers. They were drawn off from *walking in the light, as God is in the light,* and from a *holy fellowship one with another,* and from a daily experience that *the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin;* and were sent to school again. *They were turned away from Christ* to the pedagogue teaching of Doctors and Rabbies. The object of their faith was changed. It was no longer *Christ for them,* and *Christ in them,* but a laborious, heavy, earthly process, which threw them back under the feet of their senses and appetites. *They walked after the flesh; they bit and de-*

voured one another, and were nearly *consumed one of another*, when the Apostle called them back into the way of truth, love, and happiness. What effect his warning voice had on these *foolish, bewitched Galatians*, we know not now, with any certainty, but we shall know *in that day*.

The Roman Christians needed the Apostle's teaching in both respects. Hence the difference between this, and all his other Epistles. In the latter, we see only *edification, reproof, correction,—that they might be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works*; unto *whatsoever things are pure, and lovely, and of good report*. Herein we see also, in truth, the reason of this very full Epistle being placed first in the apostolic gospel. Not on account of any fanciful notion of Roman greatness, not any supposed precedence on that account, but because it contained *the whole truth as it is in Jesus: the one foundation on whom the whole building, fitly framed together, groweth into an holy temple in the Lord*. What great use those secondary apostles, our Reformers, made of this Epistle, when attacking the mighty fabric of Christian superstition, raised in the dark ages, and cemented by every thing earthly, sensual, and devilish, we have abundant records. There was not one of those confessions of faith, which from time to time shook that worldly Church, as the *trumpets of the seven angels* shake *the kingdoms of this world, till they become the kingdoms of the Lord*, that was not founded chiefly on this copious Epistle; while those on the contrary part hardly dared to mention it. Rome was exposed and undermined in those days, and will be finally crushed by the Epistle to the Romans!

With eyes that only God can give, the Apostle views, in the first chapter, the mighty fabric of Heathen pretension to wisdom and virtue. The Capitol and Parnassus; the visible and invisible delusion! The glory of Universal Dominion, with all the heroes, lawgivers, philosophers, rhetoricians, and poets, which, so far above the pigmy splendours of Jaggernaut, set off the pompous delusion, and covered the deep, damning depravity that caused *hell to open her mouth, and enlarge herself without measure*, is

beheld by him, in the light of God, as rubbish to be removed, with all its putrid decorations, *and given to the devouring flame.* God in his wisdom allowed the trial. He permitted that great people to demonstrate what man could be, or do, without God; and gave them in his providence, every thing that might polish and improve human nature; and the result is known. *The world by wisdom knew not God.* Their thirty thousand fabulous deities induced a true and horrible Atheism; while a profound science and a polished literature were attained, which is still the wonder of the world! Take this filth hence! Let *the foolishness of preaching* clear the ground, and lay *the sure foundation of God, Christ crucified! The living Stone, elect and precious!—the only Name!—the only Way!—the Salvation of God!*—becoming His infinite holiness, and suited to the guilt, depravity, and helplessness of man; a consciousness of which induces that *poverty of spirit*, that humility, by which alone the gospel can be received, but for which the copious Roman language did not even afford a name; but which our Lord places as the first step in the religion of God! Man thus appears before God in his true character; *and God commends his love to us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Deep answers to deep! The captive is delivered from going down into the pit! God has found a Ransom!*

With a tender but firm mind, he contemplates those in the second and third chapters, who, like himself in the days of his pride, *judged others, but judged not themselves.* That people, for whom *God had shaken the earth, divided the sea*, and caused the world, after a lapse of ages, to know that He was still Jehovah; and who were, in this way of mighty *observation*, made the depositaries of his holy Oracles! Full-orbed in these favours of their God, and inflated by their own proud imaginations, they saw not, they would not see, how that Law, in which they gloried, pronounced their death. The curse was not attended to, while passion, appetite, and pride, formed a *carnal mind, which is enmity against God*, and *which is not*, and *cannot be, subject to his*

law. In this spirit they boasted to the world of a Messiah, *who should bind their kings in chains, and their nobles in fetters of iron:* who should subjugate them to Abraham's seed, to the institutes of Moses, and to the God of their own vain imaginations. The Apostle wept over these proud pretenders to the *election of God*, and over the ruin that awaited them. He declares, that *indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish*, should be the *portion of every soul of man that doeth evil*, inflicted by that *infinitely holy Judge, who is no respecter of persons;* and upon *the Jew first, who by the letter of the Law, and by Circumcision*, that mark of the Lord's peculiar covenant, so exceedingly *dishonoured God.*

II. The Apostle having thus *delivered his soul*, launches, in the following chapters, into deep water, even into *the heighth, and depth, the length and breadth of the love of Christ!* The infinite love which had rescued him, appears in the behalf of both Jews and Gentiles, in all its FULNESS, as he turns from the poverty and vain pretensions of the creature to the *unsearchable riches of the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier! He that believeth shall be saved, and he*, and only he, *who believeth not, shall be damned. There is none righteous; no, not one.* Were the possibility allowed, that one man had escaped the general contagion, the claim would be made by every child of Adam. The human race, as proud, as impure, would each assert his fancied excellence, and no *mouth would be stopped*, nor would *the world ever become guilty before God!* Consequently there would be no place for *the righteousness of God!* Nor could it have, in the noise of these carnal boastings, the credit of even *a cunningly-devised fable.* But where are the believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, who, *when the commandment comes*, acknowledge its divinity, and sink, *and die* under the declarations of God! Let them behold their remedy! *A righteousness without the Law*, but having the same divine Authority, and *attested by the Law and the Prophets*, awaits their labouring, burdened, sin-sick souls. A redemption altogether divine, and wholly of God, by which the Deity is

unveiled! God existing in Three Persons, *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, in whose name those humble, contrite, believing souls are to be baptized, is now proclaimed to them. *God the Father so loving the world, as to give his only-begotten Son; God the Son so loving the world, as to empty and humble Himself, and become obedient to death, even the death of the cross; and God the Holy Ghost, so loving the world, as to wait and knock at the proud and carnal heart of man, and* even beg for admission! While *to believers, who open the door*, the heavenly Guest "bids the new creation be!" "He shines, Father and Son to shew!" *He witnesses with their spirits, that they are accepted in the Beloved*, and so *children of God.*

The fondly supposed pretensions of the Jews, in behalf of their illustrious father Abraham, to a *justification by works*, are examined in the fourth chapter, and found to have no place in the Oracles of Jehovah. All *justification*, as sinners, is there *by Faith*; nor is there any exception for those laborious strivers after *righteousness by the law*, so feelingly described, as having been his own case, in the seventh chapter. In all that conflict, we see that even where human pride is so abased, that the man would gladly take the mould of God's law, (the only mould known to such, for the Atonement is not once brought forward during the whole dolorous description;) and even where the worldly spirit is so mortified, that it *delights in the law of God after the inward man*, still *the law of sin in the members*, the bent to sinning, (a trifle, a nothing with philosophical divines,) poisons all that they attempt, and spoils all that they perform. Still, however, they labour on in the fire, till subdued to *the righteousness of God*, the almost despairing soul cries for help, *Wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me? Help is laid on one that is mighty. God has given them a Saviour, and a great one!* The circumstance of a long or short process,—a fifty, or a five hundred pence debtor, an honourable or a mean sinner, a learned or an unlearned malefactor, is nothing, when that Saviour is pleaded in *poverty of spirit.* There is but one word be-

tween chaos and creation. Let that word be spoken, and that sinful man is "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven." The love of a pardoning God overflows his believing soul,

"Like the great ocean when some dam gives way."

The robe of evangelical righteousness is given to him. *Being justified by faith, he has peace with God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom also he has access through faith into that grace wherein he stands, and rejoices in hope of the glory of God. Yea, he glories in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom he has now received the atonement.*

Therefore, *as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, even so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. For as by the disobedience of one man, many* (all that were in his loins,) *were made sinners,* so *by the obedience of One, the Lord from heaven, shall many* (all who believe,) *be made righteous. Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin had reigned unto death, so grace might reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* This is the only way to victory and peace. God has appointed no other. This is the foundation of the *new Covenant*, shadowed by the old, but essentially different with respect to its subjects. In this covenant, there is no insulation, no separation from the rest of mankind, no visible theocracy. *Those who believe, and have the power to become sons of God, are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* They are called *to walk with their invisible Head in white! They hear his voice;* that voice which is rich in merciful invitations to all, and which offers life to all, but confers the blessing only on those who hear it by faith. Its language is, *Come ye out from among them, and be separate, and touch not the unclean thing, and I will receive you, and be a Father to you, and you shall be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty.* Such are *strangers and pilgrims* here below, and know, and acknowledge, "this earth is not their place."

Behold, says St. John, *what manner of love it is wherewith the Father hath loved us, that we should be called the sons of God! Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Conformed to the image of his Son, they walk as he also walked.* Nor is this an absolutely new dispensation. No; to it, as well as to Him who prepared, reveals, and gives it, *bare all the Prophets witness.* Moses also declared he was but the fore-runner of *that Prophet, whom they must hear in all things.* Jeremiah declares, that the covenant, in that day should become wholly spiritual. *Behold the days come*, says the Apostle, quoting from him, *when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel. I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not need to teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord, for all shall know me,* (all that are in this covenant,) *from the least unto the greatest; for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.* Behold the entrance to this spiritual covenant, *The knowledge of God!* How? As philosophers? or scholars? O Pride, thou wast not made for man! None can *by searching find out God!* But he will *reveal himself*, when we plead in our own true character. *Put off thine ornaments from thee, that I may know what to do unto thee, saith the Lord.* When we say, in truth,

> " Dust and ashes is my name,
> My all is sin and misery!
> Friend of sinners, spotless Lamb,
> Thy blood was shed for me!"

Then he will treat with us. We shall know him as a pardoning God. A guilty creature *can know* him in no other way. *He will be merciful to our unrighteousness, and will remember our sins no more.* He will also say, with power, *Go, and sin no more:* for he will *write his law upon our hearts.* And *this knowledge of God* no man *can teach* another. But all who enter in at this door into the holy

place, *are taught of God*, to know, to love, and to glorify him as their pardoning God. And they receive with gratitude all the teaching that can enable them to know him more, and serve him better. They say to God and man, what I know not, teach thou me! Here the wise men of this world are caught! Here their wise folly is made manifest! They who will not know Him *thus*, shall perish without knowledge! *They shall*, they must, *die in their sins, and where He is they cannot come!*

Here is, in truth, the "scheme of virtue," dreamed of by not a few learned doctors, but never to be realized in their systems.

> "Talk they of morals? O Thou bleeding Love!
> Thou teacher of new morals to mankind;
> The grand morality is love of Thee!"

The Lord is indeed a God to those who thus come to Him; and they are to him a people. I know my sheep, says he, *and am known of mine.* But has the Tempter forgot his subtlety? or laid aside his malignant design? O no; but he varies the bait. For those who can no longer be seduced by self-approving notions of their own virtue; who see the Lord, and receive his word in faith; for these the Tempter has the delusion of Antinomianism, *making void the law through faith;* He will transform himself, and become zealous for gospel truth. To those who *enter by that new and living Way*, he will suggest, *Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound!* Has not grace abounded over all sin? And ascribing to the *evil* the glory of the *remedy*, he will continue, Has not sin brought glory to God? Is it not by sin "the whole Deity is known?" Can sin then harm you? Impossible! Fear not. Leave fear to Legalists and Pharisees. *Ye shall not die.* Ye shall always believe and sing, notwithstanding all that sin can do,

> "Before the Throne my *Surety* stands,
> My name is written on his hands."

What is all sin, when weighed against the blood of Christ? and against faith in him? *Ye shall not die.*—The Apostle *needed not that any man should teach him this mystery of iniquity;* this device of the *old Serpent*, whereby so many who were brought out of Egypt, have perished in the wilderness. In the full display of God, as the Redeemer of man, contained in this Epistle, he has not forgotten to warn the children of God, in the sixth chapter, against this wisdom from beneath. But to obviate it, he builds not again the legal delusion which he had destroyed. He seeks not again the arms of self-righteousness for their defence, (which would keep them in this tempting world just as safe as they kept self-confident Peter in the palace of the high priest,) but he maintains the sacred obligations which their relation to God, through Christ, and their reconciliation by him, lays them under. *How shall we*, says he, *who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that his servants ye are whom ye obey? whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?* Are not they who behold the Crucified by faith, *crucified with him, that henceforth they should not serve sin?* The mere pupil of evangelical notions, *who has received the seed as on a rock*, may be led captive by this delusion; but it has no power over those who have truly *come to God*, by the atoning Saviour, and who *abide in him.* They know the very different services of sin and righteousness; and their happy souls exulting in new power, behold and sensibly know, *whose servants they are.* They taste their glorious liberty. *Being made free from sin, and become servants to God, their fruit is unto holiness, and their end everlasting life. The wages of sin*, under every dispensation, *is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* Hence they cry, with St. John, *This is love, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous to those who love Him.* And in the day of assembled worlds, when *He that sitteth on the throne shall say, Behold I make all things new*, the radical characters of these *new creatures*, meet for the *new heaven* opened to them, however in the present state they may have

differed in externals, shall be thus proclaimed, *Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation that keepeth the truth, the whole truth as it is in Jesus, may enter in.*

The covenant, thus ordered in all things and sure, was always *by grace through faith,* though proud, self-righteous man has often made it void, to the ruin of his own soul. This St. Paul demonstrates in the ninth, and two following chapters. In these he largely proves, that God has an absolute right to shew mercy on what terms he pleases, and that, consequently, *it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy;* and that he has a right also to withhold it from those who will not accept it on His own gracious terms. These terms, the Apostle largely shews, are not arbitrary, but founded on the real condition of man, and the infinitely exalted character of God.* That the Apostle, while thus declaring the one

* All who truly receive these glorious truths, are deeply occupied with their own hearts. The gospel exhibits the depth of God's mercy in union with his justice and holiness, as answering to the depth of man's misery. All who truly enter into this, must also enter into *the deep things of God.* He invites all men to this, and convinces them of the necessity of it; but how many turn aside, and seek an easier path! The late Dr. Priestley was an instance of this truth. In the year 1791, he published a pamphlet, in which he gave to the public several letters, containing the early correspondence of Mr. Wesley with some of his relations and intimate friends. In this publication, the Doctor laments that "one of the first of human character," (so he denominated Mr. Wesley,) "should not have adopted *rational* principles of religion." "I also," says the Doctor, "was much troubled in my youth, with notions concerning Original Sin, the Atonement of Christ, Justification, Adoption, and the Work of the Spirit of God." There can be no doubt that he was thus troubled. The Holy Ghost would do His office. He would *convince* the Doctor *of sin,* and shew him his own true character, even as the most ignorant and base; and the one true Remedy which God has provided for a sinful world. The analogy of faith, containing these truths which exhibit the evil, and reveal the Remedy, and which the Doctor says "troubled him," would appear at that time of humiliation, of the highest importance. But, alas! he healed his wound slightly. There were also learned brothers at hand, to afford him their assistance. Dr. Taylor especially, furnished him with *a key* to lock up all these truths, and to set him at liberty from their painful visitations. The learned Doctor of Divinity assured his learned Brother, that he was already *a child of God, adopted* into the family of Jehovah; that he was

purpose of Jehovah, in all His dispensations, and according to which men were chosen or rejected, had not the least thought of absolute personal election, or reprobation, will be manifest to every unprejudiced reader. Such a system would have swept away, and rendered void, the whole doctrine of the Epistle. The ninth chapter, which has especially been thought to contain that doctrine, is in truth a defence of *justification by faith;* not by creaturely argument, but by shewing its divine origin, and bringing in the authority of Jehovah. This is the remedial way that God, from the beginning, made known to fallen man; and the

justified, *sanctified*, *and* an *heir of God;* yea, *a king and a priest* in the Messiah's kingdom! That he had only to receive the gospel as a "scheme of virtue," and that his own efforts would accomplish all! What an easy way *for the kingdoms of this world to become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ!* Surely there needed no seal to be opened in order to shew this wonder to the heavenly hierarchies! How little did St. Paul know of this gospel, which *flesh and blood had revealed* to the learned Doctor, either when he cried out, *O the depth!* or when he stood and answered for himself before the throned and delegated powers of the Roman empire! What an apology this scheme would have been for the Christian religion! Instead of this, he demanded *repentance and faith* in the name of that *God who sent him to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God:* that *they might receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them which are sanctified.* It is much to be lamented, that Dr. Taylor, an eminent man in several respects, should have meddled with the Sacred Volume. He has, by so doing, deeply injured the cause of truth. What a fungus is to a healthy plant, that is the Doctor's Key and Commentary to this Epistle:—they spread death over it. The deepest ignorance of the subject on which he writes, is manifest throughout that dead work; for we must not suppose the Doctor to have *designed* the overthrow of the Christian Revelation. His reasonings on the great doctrines of the gospel are of the most abject description; and even where the truth is not directly opposed, or violated, it is lowered to his own standard, (1 Cor. ii. 14,) and consequently is not *the truth as it is in Jesus.* How revolting to a mind renewed in knowledge, and who is acquainted with the subtleties by which men *deny the Lord that bought them* with impunity, is the Doctor's comment on that plain and full declaration of the Holy Ghost, concerning the Deity of Christ, chap. ix. 5! How he calls forth all his powers to *make to himself the image of a little God!* How satisfactory, how cheering, to those who know the truth, is Mr. Wesley's Answer, in which he grinds to powder the idol maker's laboured production! Can we wonder that this work has made so many infidels? Shall we not rather wonder at the ignorance, or the extreme insensibility, of the writer, who, according to very credible testimony, used to express great surprise that he could not keep his own people from becoming Deists!

only way of restoration, according to the Scriptures, consistent with His own infinite perfections. That this is the scope of the Apostle's teaching, is as clear as the light, when he sums up his argument, in the close of the chapter. *What shall we say, then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is by faith. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For* having a high opinion of themselves, and of their exclusive privileges, *they stumbled at that stumbling-stone, Christ crucified. As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a Stumbling-stone, and a Rock of offence; and whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed.*

The hortatory part commences with the twelfth chapter. Entire consecration to Him who lived, and died, and rose again, and ever lives in our nature, and in our behalf, is the loving demand of Him whom we are called to worship; the answer of a *good conscience towards God*, and the *reasonable service of those who are not their own, but bought with a price;* and who, by this new and divine obligation, are *to glorify God with their bodies and spirits which are His;* and to which *conformity to this world* is the desecrating opposite. Meantime their new powers are to be fully employed in spreading the savour of His name among perishing sinners, and in *edifying the body of Christ.* In order to this, the Holy Ghost has

> "Different gifts on each bestowed,
> Tempered by the art of God."

The brotherhood thus formed, by the call of the gospel, obeyed in faith; "*cœtus credentiam;*" the assembly of believers, (according to the Church of England's definition of a church of Christ, the only true one,) *of living stones,*

> "Drawn by the music of His name,
> And charmed into a beauteous frame,"

are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Christ Jesus. To those who thus believe, He is precious! And they are to Him *a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people;* and their employment is, *to shew forth His praises, who has called them out of darkness into his marvellous light.*

Unlike to the world, heady, high-minded, contentious, these *new creatures* are to avoid *doubtful disputations*, chapter the fourteenth. They are to *walk in all lowliness and meekness, forbearing one another in love:* and having especially the greatest tenderness for each other's consciences, in all those questions which might arise out of the former preparatory dispensation of God. *We know that God spake by Moses*, was a proposition that must always have a mighty effect on a mind made tender by faith, but uninformed concerning the great design of God. The liberty in which those walked who knew that design, and its glorious fulfilment; and who also knew that *righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*, constituted the kingdom of the Messiah, might prove a fatal stumbling-block to those who, believing the Mosaic institutions to be still in force, and fearful of defilement, tremblingly tasted their food. The wisdom and love of the Apostle is here conspicuous. While *he gave place by subjection,—no, not for an hour*, to those who would arrogantly bring the disciples into bondage, he tenderly felt for those weak but conscientious brethren. No self-denial, however rigorous, seemed grievous to him, so he might avoid making any of Christ's members weak, whom the Lord had received, and would tenderly lead, *to be strong in Him and in the power of His might.* He remembered his own prejudices, and how graciously he had been delivered from them; and he mightily strove that *the unity of the Spirit should be kept in the bond of peace.* Only in this way can the Redeemer's kingdom prosper. All force, as well as all guile, is abhorrent to its nature. *Love is all and in all! A love that hopeth and beareth all things, and that envieth not. Thus speaking the truth in love, and bearing*

each other's burdens, they were to grow up into Him in all things, who is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh an increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love. For *the church* thus called and formed, in a special sense, *Christ gave himself; that he might purify it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy, and without blemish, even in His presence; to whom be glory!*

Their obedience to the providential government of their Lord, is lovingly, but most strictly commanded, in the thirteenth chapter. Faith is thus taught to look at the *powers appointed* for civil rule, as *the ordination of God*, whom to *resist* is declared to be *a resistance of the ordinance of the Lord; which he will not hold guiltless.* The Jewish converts especially, had need of this promulgation *of His will, who is the Head of all principality and power, and every name that is named, either in this world, or in that which is to come.* These children of the stock of Abraham, were trained up in a hatred of the government of the Heathen, and were ripe for revolt at the appearance of any impious pretender. But worldly dominion is not founded in grace, as the religious madmen of the seventeenth century taught, and by which they overthrew the established government. By this gross mistake, and by their unfaithfulness, and admission of worldly ambition, they threw away one of the brightest displays of evangelical truth and power, that the world has been favoured with since the days of the Apostles; and brought a disgrace on the cause of God, from which it has not yet been wholly delivered. But those who *abide in Christ*, see this snare also, and avoid it. Faith beholds the all-disposing hand of Jehovah, ruling in the whirlwind, and directing the storms of this fallen world. The orb of believers is far above these disorders, though they feel their pressure and contrariety; and from that orb, those *heavenly places, where they sit with Christ*, they behold that throne to which all things shall be ultimately subdued. *Their*

glorious Head sitteth above these water-floods, and remaineth a King for ever! The King, Eternal, Immortal, Invisible! The blessed and only Potentate; the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords! Who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable! Whom no man hath seen or can see! To whom be honour and power everlasting! Amen!

III. In those favoured places where the Apostle of God planted the *tree of righteousness*, the gracious design of *the Father of mercies, and the God of all consolation*, was fully manifested in the happiness and consequent holiness of the people. There was a BLESSEDNESS, as he expresses himself to the Galatians, resting on those who believed, that only God can give. A happiness resulting from a faith which is *the evidence of things not seen*, and which *beholding our Advocate with the Father* triumphant over sin and death, *worships God in the Spirit, rejoices in Christ Jesus, and has no confidence in the flesh.* To the Roman believers, not favoured with his personal ministry, he displays this blessedness in this astonishing chapter, which may be truly called the believers' triumph. It *begins* with a triumph over guilt: *There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ! Though their sins were as scarlet, they are as white as snow!* That God who is love, whom they have offended, *has cast their sins as a stone into the depths of the sea: He remembers them no more!*

> "While Jesu's blood through earth and skies,
> Mercy, free, boundless mercy cries!"

They have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of their sins. It *proceeds* with a triumph over sin; its dominion is broken. Those unruly appetites, those craving desires, which grow by indulgence; that *corruption which is through lust*, all feel the power of *Him who maketh all things new! They are not debtors to the flesh, like unregenerate men*, and as even the groaning penitent, described in the former chapter, who says, with Kempis, "Thou dust, learn to obey!" *The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, maketh*

them free from the law of sin and death. Their faith realizes their great privilege. They know, they feel, that God having *sent his own Son in the flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh,* but *after the Spirit. The spirit of bondage unto fear gives place to the Spirit of adoption. They cry, Abba, Father! The Spirit itself beareth witness with their spirit that they are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us.* And it *ends* with a triumph over all *fear that hath torment. Who,* says the exulting Apostle, *shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?* As *it is written, for thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that hath loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.*

The Apostle, viewing with enlightened eyes this world of death, anticipates a triumph also over the abuse, misery, and corruption of the creation at large, (verse 20.) *The creature,* says he, *was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.* A mind like his, imbued with life,—a mind that could penetrate the fall of man, and behold the original work of God, and see all things *good* and *fair,*—could not but weep over the creatures, thus subjected, not by their own fault, but by that fall. The feelings of David, on a particular occasion, must be heightened in the Apostle's heart, made tender by divine love:—*I have sinned, I have done wickedly! But these sheep,* these countless multitudes of creatures, *groaning and travailing together,*

what have they done? Hark! A glad voice this groaning world cheers! *The creation shall be delivered!** The inferior creatures fell with their liege lord: with him, now restored, and reunited to *his* Lord, they shall have their humble, happy lot in the new earth. The love of God wills that they should share with the *children of God*, and not with *the reprobate*. The curse shall no more be seen, or known, except where it is wilfully and obstinately *chosen*, notwithstanding all the offers of redeeming love. The temple of the universe shall be furnished anew with life, as in the time of innocence. Death shall be done away, and the triumphant challenge shall sound through the renovated universe, *O Death, where is thy sting! O grave,*

* Mr. Wesley's comment on this passage, (his "Free Thoughts" he has given us in a separate publication,) is just what might be expected from a man of God, who never forgets that he is expounding the *Sacred Oracles:* and consequently never speaks *positively*, where the Lord does not *fully* reveal his mind: it is, however, highly satisfactory. "Destruction," says he, "is not deliverance. Therefore, whatsoever is destroyed, or ceases to be, is not delivered at all. Will then any part of the creation be destroyed?" No: the all-wise *Creator* will be glorified. The great deliverance is *revealed* in this gracious intimation. But is it not very strange, that this passage should be interpreted as declarative of God's design to grant an evangelical deliverance and conversion to the Gentiles, when that design is evidently the great subject of this Epistle, and was then in powerful and glorious progress? The church in Judea had proclaimed, long before, that *God had given to the Gentiles also repentance unto life.* Many of the burning and shining lights of the Church at Rome, and elsewhere, were Gentiles. *I speak to you Gentiles*, says St. Paul: *forasmuch as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify my office.* This he did continually. He blazoned the gracious design through the world. He declared, as upon the house-top, *that the Gentiles were fellow-heirs of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ by the gospel. The unsearchable riches of Christ were preached to the Gentiles*, and bestowed on all who believed. And after all this, are we sent to this passage, (which evidently refers to the inferior creatures,) to spell out this great design, thus fully manifested? Surely not. If, however, *responsible* creatures, (who if they fall, certainly fall by *wilful* offence,) must be forced into the interpretation, would it not be less revolting to reason, to choose the Jewish nation, rather than the Gentiles? That people were *shut up in unbelief:* and *upon them wrath was come to the uttermost.* Upon them also the Apostle prophetically declares, *the night of blindness should continue till the fulness of the Gentiles should come in.* Concerning *their* deliverance, there is also something *mysterious* predicted, (chap. xi. 26;) so that upon the whole, it would be much more plausible to say that the Jewish nation were the *creatures* to be *delivered*.

where is thy victory! Every voice shall ascend in the grand chorus, *Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ!*

We read that Alexander the Great, so called, was recovered from his proud dream of divinity, by his wounds, and the flowing of his blood. The children of God, who *are made partakers of the Divine nature*, (in a sense which that inflated worm no more understood than did the famous horse he rode,) are not thus to be *shorn of their strength.* Their faith is powerful, but exercised with sobriety, and founded in truth. In the waves of trouble, in suffering and in dying, they *hold fast their confidence.* They behold *the Lamb in the midst of the throne*, but it is *as slain;* and the *hallelujahs* of heaven, as *mighty thunderings*, are given to Him under that character. They see the path in which His footsteps shine. They see it was ordained of old, even from everlasting, and founded on the infinite *fore-knowledge* of God, as the Apostle declares, in this chapter, that believers should be *called*, *justified*, and *glorified*, as *conformed to the image of His Son.* They see their suffering Head; and the Apostle thus states the consummation of that divine conformity:—*If so be that we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together.* Hence they are not called back to earth by the *sufferings of the present time;* they count them not worthy to *be compared to the glory that shall be revealed in them. They glorify God in the fires. They wonder not, as though some strange thing happened to them. To you*, says the suffering Apostle, *who bore about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus; to you it is given not only to believe, but also to suffer for His sake. It is a faithful saying, If we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we suffer we shall reign with Him; if we deny Him, he will deny us.* Our Lord, while he speaks of thrones of glory as awaiting his disciples, warned them that through sufferings was the way. *Ye shall weep and lament*, says He, *but the world shall rejoice. Marvel not if the world hate you. Ye know it hated me, before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love its own, but because ye are not of*

the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Hence St. Paul exultingly declares, *I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus. If you are reproached for the name of Christ,* says St. Peter, *happy are ye; for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.* This *reproach* is the lowest degree of that persecution which remains after the power of truth has so overcome the world, that there is no more *legal* opposition. *If any man,* in any the most favoured age or place, *will live godly in Christ Jesus, he shall thus far suffer.* Hence our Lord places it among the beatitudes, in which he sums up the whole of his religion: *Blessed are you when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for so persecuted they the Prophets that were before you.*

The reason is, they whose *faith overcomes the world, and who are joined to the Lord, are of one Spirit. Behold the Lamb of God!* Patient in bearing ill, and doing well. Never contending for any personal advantage or comfort. *The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, are not of the Father, but are of the world:* therefore the Son renounced them all. *Being found in fashion as a man,* He was subject to his heavenly Father in all things, enduring His whole will. *Meek and lowly in heart,* He was the refuge and the comforter of all who turned to God at His reproof, and *whom his Father gave to Him,* as the converts of His truth. But how constant, how determined, and, at times, how dreadful, were His reproofs, and his opposition to those who dishonoured his Father, either in his holy law, or in his gracious dispensation of mercy to a lost world. He exposed and unmasked the hypocrisy of the most admired characters; and compared the men who were in the highest reputation for wisdom and sanctity, *to whited walls, and painted sepulchres;* warning the people against them as *blind guides and deceivers!* John Valdesso well observes, that "He brought his death upon himself by his divine faithfulness; and that had He submitted to that kind of patient endurance of those violations of the

will and word of Him who sent Him, which the generality of those who *call Him Lord* manifest, He never would have been crucified:" consequently He could not have been the promised Deliverer, and we must have *looked for another!*

Behold the strait, the Royal Way! *To him that overcometh, will I give to sit with me upon my throne*, says the Redeemer, *even as I overcame, and am set down with my Father upon His throne.* Behold the true cause, and the real nature, of those persecutions, sufferings, opposition, and contempt, which is truly of God, and which the Lord will honour. How soon would the world be overcome, if all who profess His faith were faithful to it! *Woe to the rebellious children*, who compromise truth, and in effect, deny their Master! Who hath required this at their hands? Could they not follow with the crowd, who cry, *Lord, Lord!* Will they have the *adoption and the glory?* Will they aim at that honour implied in those words, *Ye are my witnesses?* Will they indeed be sons? Then let them see the path! The way is open, see that ye walk therein! *The false apostles, the deceitful workers, shall have their reward;* the same that those of old had, *the praise and esteem of men.* While the faith of those who truly *call Him Father and Lord*, and *who walk in the light as He is in the light;* who submit, like Him and His true followers, *to be counted as the filth of the world, shall be found unto praise, and honour, and glory!*

Let such consider what their invisible Head, *upon whose shoulders is the government, who loves them, and who knoweth whereof they are made*, may in His infinite wisdom call them to suffer. Let them not turn from the prospect, but make up a steady mind, to have His will done in them, and for them, and by them! Let them contemplate the way of the cross. The eye of nature sickens, and revolts from the view of suffering. Nature loves its comforts; and *all that a man hath will he give for his life.* "Conscience, meantime, makes cowards of us all;" so that our natural pride, though so mighty in operation, will hardly rush on danger, even to avoid the debasing imputation of dishonourable fear. But

the terrors of an *awakened* conscience who can tell, but those who groan beneath its load! *A wounded spirit who can bear?* Is there any power in man superior to these? To timid idolatrous nature, and tormenting conscience? Or must a man toil on thus burdened, in momentary expectation of that climax of all things terrible, death, that unveils eternity? Must he abide in *a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation?* Behold the Blessedness of this Epistle! the exceeding blessedness of this chapter! That power, known only to God, and revealed in His Word, is FAITH. Faith strengthens nature, by shewing and imparting our true life, and assuring us that *all is ours!* Thus *strengthening* the feebleness of nature *with all might, unto all long-suffering, with joyfulness!* By the same divine gift, conscience is satisfied. She beholds the Lawgiver become the Atonement; and if the voice of fear attempt again to repeat, *It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God*, Faith drowns the feeble cry, and thus triumphantly challenges all accusers:—*Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth! Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died; yea rather that is risen again; who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us! Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ?*

I. Let us contemplate the enemies set before us, by one who encountered them all, and proved their imbecility.

II. Let us behold the issue, the safety, the triumph: *they cannot separate us from the love of Christ;* from the protection which he will certainly afford us, the grace which he will surely give us, or the glory which he has prepared for us!

I. *Shall tribulation or distress?* These are general terms, comprising all the common afflictions of life, with their heighteñed power, in a mind imbued with truth, goodness, and hatred to the evil cause of all trouble. Shall these *separate us from His love*, who submitted to them all for us? Hear the Apostle! *Tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope.* The plants of God, in this soil, give not forth their odour till they are pressed.

Hence the world has been filled with the rich perfume of the primitive saints, *who endured as seeing Him that is invisible!* The pressure of tribulation is common to all men; but behold the difference! *The approved are made manifest. They are counted*, manifestly shewn to be, *worthy of the kingdom of God for which they suffer.* While the horrible worthiness of those *who despise the riches of his grace*, produce, by these pressures, the putrid odour of rebellion and blasphemy! *Blessed*, says the Apostle, *be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.*

II. *Shall persecution separate us from His love* and guardian care? We have already seen the ground of this. *Ye are not of the world*, says our Lord and Master, *even as I am not of the world.* His children cheerfully allow this, and are willing to follow Him, singing, with the church of the first-born,

> "Strangers and Pilgrims here below,
> This earth we know is not our place."

They only desire a passage through the land, from those whose momentary portion it is become by their own unhappy choice. But this favour cannot be always granted to the servants of Christ. They are often chased from place to place; they are *despitefully used, and persecuted. All manner of evil is spoken of them falsely, for His sake who loveth them. They are troubled on every side, but not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; cast down, but not destroyed. Always bearing about in their body the dying of the Lord Jesus!* The storm may rise higher. They may be called to have fellowship in the sufferings of those *who had trial of cruel mockings, and scourgings; yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment. They may be driven from men to wander in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth; destitute, afflicted, tormented.* But shall this separate them from His love, who knoweth what sore temptations mean?

My sheep, says he, *hear my voice, I know them, and they follow me*:—they follow Him into all these sufferings, and "glory in their Guide;"—*and I give unto them eternal life*; they feel the glorious beginning of it;—*and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.*

III. *Shall famine or nakedness?* Shall the loss of earthly goods, even those that seem essential to life, to the life of that body which was made out of the dust, and must be by it sustained; shall this destroy the Faith of His true followers, or *separate them from His love?* The love of Christ shall take care for this also. They hear his voice, saying to them, *Why take ye thought for raiment? Behold the lilies of the field! They toil not, neither do they spin; yet, I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these! Ye received*, says the Apostle to the Hebrews, *ye received joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing that you have in heaven a better and an enduring substance.* But famine assumes a more dreadful aspect. O, want of bread! not only for ourselves, but for those we love, to whom perhaps we have given life, and in whose lives our *life is bound up*; who can tell what this means, but those who have felt it! Behold Israel in Canaan! The *prince with God* wants bread! He reads the anguish of his household in their speechless looks. At length the troubles of his soul finds utterance:—*Why do ye look*, says he, *one upon another? Go down into Egypt and buy bread for us, that we may live and not die.* But what a trial awaits the aged Patriarch! His Benjamin, the son of his love, and of his age, must he send him into perils, with Joseph's death, and Simeon's imprisonment before the eyes of his fainting mind! Yes, Benjamin must go. *The desire of his eyes* must be be given up. Hunger breaks through this stone wall.—Consider the case of Elijah, the most faithful, and the most honoured of all God's prophets. A famine is sent from Jehovah to chastise the desperate wickedness of Israel. *God comes out of his place, to make inquisition for blood*, and the Prophet is called into the Lord's *chamber, and the door is shut about him.* The Lord gives him a *hiding-place by the*

brook Cherith, that is beside Jordan, and he drinks of the brook: and by the command of their Maker, in whom *they* also live, *the ravens feed him.* The Lord will try his faith. The brook dries up! But the well spring of life is near, and he is not separated from it. *Arise,* says the Lord, *get thee to Zarephath, which belongeth to Zidon, and dwell there; behold I have commanded a widow woman there to sustain thee.* The Prophet obeyed. At the gate of the city he encounters an indigent female, of whom he solicits a little water, and a morsel of bread. She replied, *As the Lord thy God liveth, I have not a cake, but an handful of meal in a barrel, and a little oil in a cruse, and behold I am gathering two sticks that I may go in and dress it for me and my son, that we may eat it and die.* And is this the person whom his God *had commanded to sustain him?* Yes; the Prophet shall *bring* a blessing, as well as receive it! Hitherto all was trial; now comes the blessing. Just then the Lord made known his will. *And Elijah said unto her, Fear not; for thus saith the Lord God of Israel, the barrel of meal shall not waste, neither shall the cruse of oil fail, until the day that the Lord sendeth rain upon the earth.* Let those *who love Him, because He first loved them,* take notice of this. He has Himself personally known this strong temptation. The baffled Tempter, who took advantage of it in the Wilderness, has not forgotten it. Israel found in the Wilderness, *that man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. He gave them bread from heaven: they eat angels' food.* The five thousand that sat down at our Lord's table, found no lack, though the food was hardly sufficient for his own family! In all extraordinary cases, His stores shall be opened. In common life He hath taught us *to pray for daily bread,* and to be satisfied with it. *Let your disposition* therefore *be without covetousness, and be content with the things that ye have; for He has said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.*

IV. *Shall peril or sword?* The Apostle lived in perils. He enumerates them in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, (chap. xi.) They met him at every turn: he ex-

pected them:—they were part of his mission. *He is a chosen vessel to me,* saith the Lord, *to bear my name before kings; for I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my Name.* He was *the servant,* δουλος, *the slave of Jesus Christ:* gloriously free from all creatures, yet the servant of all in love, and divinely the slave of his Master. All his rights were laid at the feet of Him who loved Him: reputation, comfort, life itself, all sacrificed! His short definition of religion, while the tempest howled around him, in his voyage to Rome, *(That God, whose I am, and whom I serve!)* shews his entire submission. But did these perils *separate him from the love of Christ?* O no! *As the sufferings of Christ abound in us,* says he, *so our consolation aboundeth by Christ.* His faith beheld *the Lord on his right hand, that he should not be moved.* He felt the power that had supported those who trod the same path. His voice is *the same, yesterday, and to-day, and for ever! Fear not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea I will help thee; yea I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour.* In the greatest trial which we have recorded of the Apostle, (2 Cor. xii. 7,) and to which all his other afflictions seem to be considered as nothing; when hell itself was permitted to harass his de-

* The generality of commentators find it difficult to treat of spiritual conflicts; of *wrestling, not against flesh and blood only, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.* They leave these things, known only to the life of faith, to the Reformers who overcame the world; to the earlier Puritans, the first Quakers, and the primitive Methodists. It may comfort some readers, who, if they wrestle at all, know nothing of these wrestlings, to be told, That the Apostle's agonizing trial was only the vexatious opposition of a party at Corinth, and especially of one person, who was at the head of it, and perhaps had formed it! This party represented the Apostle as not being a spiritual man, (2 Cor. x. 2,) and as not having apostolical authority; (ibid. 8th verse.) He answers the latter reflection at large; and the former by making known,

voted spirit,* as soon as he knew the will of his Master, he gladly submitted to be thus sawn asunder. He had made this direct attack the subject of particular, repeated, and agonizing prayer. But being, as his Lord, *heard in that he feared*, he submits, like Him, to drink the cup, and considers it, with all his other trials, *as working for his good. Most gladly therefore*, says he, *will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the strength of Christ may rest upon me.* The victory rises to a triumph! *Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake; for when I am weak then am I strong:*

> "Jesus comes with my distress,
> And agony is heaven!"

All the children of God, who walk in the same path, will say with him, *Therefore we faint not: but though the outward man perish, the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory!*

Uncertainty with respect to the termination of these perils of God's children, is dispensed, that they may be a real trial of faith. *The Apostle frequently intimates, that he knew not whether the Lord would be glorified in his life, or in his death. But precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.* If *he puts their tears in his bottle*, how

evidently with great reluctance, (chap. xii. 11,) the spiritual favours conferred upon him, and the spiritual conflicts that succeeded. The Apostle speaks very differently, and with entire freedom, of this party throughout the Epistle, and treats them as his Divine Master did the petty oppositionists of His day. His great conflict wears an entirely different aspect, and is evidently analogous to his elevation, and to the Divine favour conferred upon him, in being *raised to the third heaven, to hear unspeakable truths*, and behold the glory of God! It might be expected that hell would assault a man thus favoured; and the Apostle informs us that the trial was permitted, *lest he should be exalted above measure.* It was the Lord's will that he should go on as humbly as before in his Divine Master's work; and as He himself did, *making himself of no reputation.* Thus exalted by Divine favour, yet safe in lowliness of heart,

> "Close by the gates of death and hell, he urged his way to heaven."

much more their blood? *The sword* (one kind of violent death put for all,) has no terror for a believer. *His life is hid with Christ in God. He fears not those who can kill the body.* They cannot *separate from the love of Christ.* They may separate the soul from the body, but death meets the desire of the faithful; *they have a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better.* The imprisoned soul is set at liberty, and resumed into the bosom of its God. St. Stephen was not separated from his Master's love, by the violent death that awaited him, and which crushed the tabernacle of his devoted spirit. The highest display of that love was reserved for that awful hour:—Behold! says he to his enemies, while *gnashing upon him with their teeth, behold! I see heaven opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God!* Nor did it separate from his spirit the love which his Lord had given him for his enemies. He collects his powers in the moment of dissolution, and his last breath issues in a prayer for them: *Lord, lay not this sin to their charge!*

In all these things, they who *fight this good fight, are more than conquerors.* Weak in themselves, *the weapons of their warfare are mighty through God.* Like Peter, they may learn in those trials, how weak their faith is, by which they have ventured to come to Him over life's rough sea. But they know where their help lieth; and Peter's cry, *Lord, save me!* brings the Lord to their aid, and places them again, "upborne on the unyielding wave." They are *more than conquerors,* 1. Because of the fruit of the conflict: *we are chastened, but it is for our profit, that we may be partakers of His holiness: it yields the peaceable fruits of righteousness.* Therefore, says St. James, *My brethren, count it all joy, when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience. The God of all grace, after you have suffered awhile,* says St. Peter, *make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you.* 2. Because of the issue. *That the trial of your faith,* says the same Apostle, *being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be*

found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearance of Jesus Christ. In that day, the suffering members of Christ shall appear with *their robes washed, and made white in the blood of the Lamb. And He shall feed them, and shall lead them to living fountains of water; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.* They shall share in His triumph; and say, like Him, *I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold! I am alive for evermore!* Thus, it appears, while *faith is the substance of things hoped for*, they are *more than conquerors.* Every victor is not made better by his victories; nor is every victor crowned. The poverty and sinfulness of this world will not admit of it. *But if we suffer with Him, we shall reign with Him! To him that overcometh, saith the Lord, will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne.*

The church of Christ militant here on earth, is a spiritual community, united to God by a living faith in the Son of His love, given for them, and living in them. *Against this church, the gates of hell shall not prevail. It is founded upon a Rock;* the truth, love, and power of Jehovah, *the High and Lofty One, who inhabiteth eternity!* His love the conquest more than gains! Having taken shelter in Him, and being sensible of the all-sufficiency of the *love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord*, they boldly face, and fearlessly contemplate the host of enemies set in array against them; and which shall continue to *strive together against the Lord, and against His Anointed, till He breaks them in pieces like a potter's vessel.* St. Paul speaks the language of the faith which pervades the whole mystical body, when he says, *I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.*

1. *Death,—the body is dead because of sin*, even when *the spirit is life, because of righteousness.* And herein is included the pains, diseases, weakness, and decay that prepare.

for the last scene; "Death's gallery," as the pious Young calls them. All this, especially dissolution, is abhorrent to nature. On account of it, we *groan, being burdened, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.* Our Lord, the perfect Pattern of sinless human nature, groaned under it, but with perfect submission. *The corruptible body may press down the soul,* but cannot *separate it from the love of Christ.* His children face their *last enemy* without *tormenting fear.* Their hearts are assured, that *death is theirs.* They are enabled to cry, *Abba, Father,* with more assurance as they approach His home. And while they feel the pressure of the dying frame, they are enabled to say, *Though I walk through the valley and shadow of death, I will fear no evil:* or, if it please *Him, who is about their bed,* they shall triumph over, and trample on their mortal foe! They shall shout, *O grave! where is thy victory? O Death! where is thy sting?*

2. *Life,*—with all its temptations, cares, duties, fears, hopes and desires,—especially the one great and continual care—*to keep a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man, in a world that lieth in the wicked one!* St. Paul allows, that *if in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable.* But he again speaks the language of the general faith: *Whether,* says he, *we live, we live unto the Lord, or if we die, we die unto the Lord; whether therefore we live or die, we are the Lord's. Neither life nor death shall separate us from His love.*

3. *Nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers.*—The angels of God we know *are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation.* From these no danger need be apprehended. Men who write without Faith, are prone to gravitate, and sink those principalities and powers (if not angels too,) so as to mean creatures like themselves, endued with political power. These we have seen the Apostle treat with his usual sobriety of mind, (chap. xiii.) But *Faith, the evidence of things not seen,* gave him to contemplate other powers. He had already mentioned all that earthly powers could do, in the *tribulation,*

peril, or sword, which are their arms against believers, and there is no tautology in his writings. These angels, principalities, and powers are of a higher origin; and this mode of description may be used to signify their stations and employments, under their chief, to whom St. Paul gives that horribly sublime title, *The god of this world! and who works in the children of disobedience.* These unhappy spirits *kept not their first estate,* and the *righteous God cast them down to hell;* from whence they issue to this fallen world, *and rule in its darkness,* as lions roaring for their prey, or as serpents seeking whom they may deceive; emboldened by their original success, that "brought death into the world, with all our woes." These fallen spirits operate upon all our powers, either mediately, through our senses, appetites, or desires, and thus, by the baits of this visible and material world, hinder repentance, and so make faith impossible; or immediately, on the spirits of men, stimulating and increasing our natural pride, self-will, and unbelief; afflicting also the faithful whom they cannot subdue. Of these temptations, the men of the world, however learned or wise, know no more than they do of the direct *witness of the Spirit of God,* or of *His teaching* or *consolations.* Earthly and sensual baits lead them captive, and so render unnecessary the more direct attacks of evil, or prevent their being perceived, while they are really set on fire of hell! But what is all their force or fraud, when compared with the guardian care of Omnipotent Love, *the Bishop of our souls?* Compared to Him, who is eternal, all these powers are as the ephemeron, the day-fly! *The eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect towards Him.* His one care is to see if *we resist these evil ones steadfast in the faith;* to behold if *His sheep hear His voice and follow Him;* then *they shall never perish. Christ has spoiled these principalities and powers, and has made a shew of them openly,* to those intelligences to whom such things are visible; and *has triumphed over them through his cross.* He is above all created powers, visible and invisible. *To Him*

every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess! And they that are with Him are called, and chosen, and faithful. They overcome by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and nothing shall *separate them from His love!*

4. *Nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature.*—Evil opposition, danger of every kind, is here introduced to our view. All that the present state of awful trial, with its almost infinite variety of temptations; all that may arise in after life, either in the intermediate state, or in the final dissolution of all these things, and the absorption of time into eternity! *Nor height*—of all creation, visible or invisible. All that boundless scene, sometimes named, but not to be comprehended by a finite mind, The infinity of space! Or that awful *depth*, where our great poet, who sung of heaven and hell, supposes his mighty traveller, in his evil voyage through chaos, to discover Paradise, arriving, where he met

> "A vast vacuity! All unawares
> Fluttering his pennons vain, plumb down he drops
> Ten thousand fathom deep: and to this hour
> Down had been falling, had not, by ill chance,
> The strong rebuff of some tumultuous cloud,
> Instinct with fire and nitre, hurried him
> As many miles aloft!"———

Supposing these immeasurable regions to be animated not only with all that scripture intimates, but with all that superstition ever feigned!—what can all these creatures, with all their accumulated terrors, do? *He that sitteth in heaven shall laugh! To His Name, who sits at God's right hand*, all creation a trembling, or a joyful homage pays. *He has the keys of hell and of death!* Yes, He is there in our nature; the humanity taken into God! And he is there in our behalf. *Fear not, thou worm!* All weakness, but intent on pleasing Him,—encourage yourself in Him, and you also *shall laugh at destruction when it cometh!* It shall *pass over*, as the destroying angel the blood-marked houses in Egypt; or, if it pleases Him you worship, to be *magnified in your death, it*

> "Shall gloriously hurry your soul to the skies!"

To the bosom of your redeeming God, *who loves and cares for you.*

" To Him shall earth and hell submit,
And every foe shall fall;
Till Death expires beneath His feet,
And God is all in all!"

I shall close the Apostle's astonishing picture of the *Blessedness* of true believers, with Mr. WESLEY's incomparable exposition of the passage.

" *I am persuaded*, that neither *death* shall hurt us; for *Christ has died: nor life;* for *Christ is risen: nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers; nor things present, nor things to come;* for *Christ is at the right hand of God: nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature;* for *Christ maketh intercession for us.*

" Neither death, terrible as it is to natural men—a violent death in particular; nor life, with all the affliction and distress it can bring; nor a long, easy life; or all living men: nor angels, whether good, (if it were possible they should attempt it,) or bad, with all their wisdom and strength: nor principalities, nor powers,—not even those of the highest rank, or most eminent power; nor things present, nor things to come,—which may occur, either when our time on earth is past, or when time itself shall end, as the final judgment, the general conflagration, the everlasting fire: nor height, nor depth:—the former sentence respected the difference of times, this the difference of places. How many great and various things are contained in those words, we do not, need not, cannot know yet. The height, in St. Paul's sublime style, is put for heaven, the depth for the great abyss:—that is, neither the height, I will not say, of walls, mountains, seas, but of heaven itself, can move us; nor the abyss itself, the very thought of which might astonish the boldest creature. Nor any creature; nothing beneath the Almighty—visible enemies he does not even deign to name—shall be able, either by force, verse 35, or by any legal claim, verse 33, &c. to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord;—

which will surely save, protect, deliver us, who believe, in and through, and from them all."

It has been well observed, by a late writer, That it was an astonishing sight to behold Moses and Joshua sitting down in their tent in the Wilderness, and calmly portioning out the land of Canaan as if already in their possession, and framing laws for the people of Israel; while mighty nations, with every advantage for military resistance, awaited their attempt, and while Jordan rolled between! *But they did not trust in their bow, neither did they think that their sword should give them the victory.* They had the word of Jehovah, *I will be with thee, and not a man shall be able to stand before you all the days of your life!* Their tranquillity, their certainty, which might be an object of pity, or of ridicule, to those who weighed the mighty design in a creaturely balance, was the confidence of faith, founded on the truth of Him who cannot lie, and of whom they had already sung, *The Lord is a man of war, the Lord is His Name! The horse and his rider he hath cast into the sea!* Before Him, mighty and well appointed armies of men, and of caterpillars, are held in the same estimation. They saw Him already as going before them *with His horses, and His chariots of salvation.* And it *was to them according to their faith. There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken to the house of Israel: all came to pass.*

This is my beloved Son, saith the Lord, hear ye Him! Prophets, and righteous men, and kings have desired to see the things that ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear the things that ye hear, and have not heard them. Shall we not then trust in that *better covenant, ounded upon better promises? To the Prophets it was revealed,* says St. Peter, *that not to themselves, but unto us they did minister the things that are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.* But this dispensation of the Spirit *suffereth violence,* and its enemies are mighty; and many of those who are upon the earth *have a name that they live,* but *they are dead;* and their *profession* is the armour

of the *wicked one*, whereby they quench all the darts of God's Spirit. The dread of suffering, the fear of consequences, keep many from *washing their robes, and making them white in the blood of the Lamb. Hear his voice! I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich.* "Do you know what you are about?" said Mr. CHARLES WESLEY to one who spoke to him of Christian perfection; "do you know that you are going to set all earth and hell against you?" *He that saith he abideth in Christ*, (how great a privilege!) *ought himself to walk even as he also walked; through honour, and through dishonour, through evil report, and good report.* And your privilege and safety will generally be the same, *as chastened, and not killed; as dying, and behold we live! as poor, yet making many rich;* as *having nothing, and yet possessing all things!*

Behold the way! and behold also where your strength lieth. Beware of Saul's armour! the wisdom or the power of this world. *The weapons of your warfare are not carnal, but mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strong holds. Destroying reasonings*, the whole routine of empty *philosophy, and vain* self-pleasing *deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;* and *ye are complete in Him.* The fulness of God overflows in the Mediator, and the fulness of the Mediator overflows in his members. By this faith, you will *bring every thought into subjection to the obedience of Christ; and be strengthened with all might by His Spirit in the inner man, unto all long-suffering with joyfulness.* Remember, that as *Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, so love*,—a love that, like *wisdom, cometh from above,—is the fulfilling of that law;* even *to love the Lord our God with all our heart, with all our mind, and with all our strength;* and consequently, *to love our neighbour*, every soul of man, *as ourselves.* Many of you remember that man of God who taught you thus, and *who being dead yet speaketh.* You know he was himself a witness of the deep humiliation which it is the *design* of this Epistle to produce in the proud, self-sufficient heart

of man; and who, while he grasped its *fulness* with a believing renovated mind, felt himself supported by its *blessedness*, when he also submitted to become *as the filth of the world*, and *the offscouring of all things*, that he might, *with that liberty wherewith Christ had made him free*, communicate to perishing sinners its unsearchable riches. How often was it fondly thought, that he would

> "Though born for the universe, narrow his mind,
> And to party give up what was meant for mankind!"

His faith looked above all *this deceivableness of unrighteousness*. His commentary on this astonishing Epistle is only inferior to the inspired work which it illustrates:—chaste, correct, luminous, and edifying! His thoughts on divine subjects in general are extracted from a world of thinking; and directed by an erudition, which not only was employed in, but commanded, the whole round of real learning; while Faith governed the invaluable talent, and kept in the one undeviating channel of truth all his attainments. *Hold fast the form of sound words, which you have heard* of him *in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.* And if you *have not believed in vain, hold fast the profession of your faith without wavering, for He is faithful who hath called you. Building yourselves up in your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God. Be not weary in well doing;* and especially in enforcing the glorious truths of this Epistle,—which, you know, *are able to save the soul. Count all things dung and dross, that you may* thus serve Him, *who, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame!* Thus go on, till you also, having done and suffered His whole will, and *declared his whole counsel, shall enter into His joy, and sit down on His throne!*

Now unto Him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy,—to the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory, and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen!

London: Printed at the Conference-Office, 14, City-Road,
By THOMAS CORDEUX, Agent.